









Digitized by the Internet Archive  
in 2007 with funding from  
Microsoft Corporation











# REMARKS

ON THE

REV. S. R. CATTLEY'S

DEFENCE OF HIS EDITION

OF

FOX'S MARTYROLOGY.

---

BY THE

REV. S. R. MAITLAND,

LIBRARIAN TO HIS GRACE THE ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY.

---

LONDON:

PRINTED FOR J. G. F. & J. RIVINGTON,

ST. PAUL'S CHURCH YARD,

AND WATERLOO PLACE, PALL MALL.

---

1842.

THE

OF THE

OF THE

LONDON :

GILBERT & RIVINGTON, PRINTERS,  
ST. JOHN'S SQUARE.

May 10. 18. 2005

## REMARKS,

&c.

---

IN "The Defence of this edition by the Editor," contained in the first volume of Fox's Martyrology, just published by Messrs. Seeley and Burnside, Mr. Cattley says:—

"In November, 1837, Mr. Maitland had expended all his observations upon Foxe, preparing the public for a renewal of them at some future time. When this is to appear, the Editor does not know; but, in the mean time, he thanks his critical reviewer for the many hints that he has already given him, and he contemplates with pleasure the appearance of Mr. Maitland's future labours, which will supply admirable additions to the appendices to these volumes. But should these labours not appear as yet, the Editor's care will be to make this edition perfect in its kind, worthy of the age in which it is published, and of the illustrious patronage under which it appears."—p. 495.

The "Six more Letters," which I have since reprinted from the "British Magazine," will show that I had not expended all my observations in Novem-

ber, 1837. The series went on quite regularly, except that (whether for my convenience or the editor's I am not sure) the letter which should have appeared in May was postponed until June 1838. I believe, however, that Mr. Cattley's statement, as well as the omission of all reference to that part of the series of letters which was published after the time which he mentions by Mr. Townsend, is only another manifestation of the ignorance and carelessness which characterize their proceedings. Whether Mr. Cattley's thanks and pleasant anticipations are sincere or ironical, I will furnish him with notices of some things which I have observed since my Letters were published, and in them he may probably find matter for his Appendix; but I must first offer a few remarks on some other things in his Defence.

First, let it be observed, that of all the statements made in my Letters, Mr. Cattley has not challenged one. I do not say that he might not have done it, or that he will not do it; but merely that he has not done it. As to the reasons for this, and for the postponement of all notice of the heaps of errors contained in the former volumes, people will form their own opinions. I do not, however, notice the matter so much to complain of what has not been done, as to draw attention to the pledge respecting *what is to be done*. With distinct reference to at least the whole of my first Six Letters, Mr. Cattley says, "The indexes, the appendices, and the cancel leaves, will reply

to *all this*<sup>1</sup>." No doubt the cancel leaves, which the publishers calculate at "between 200 and 300," (a calculation by the way made under the very erroneous assumption that "in the last four or five volumes . . . . not only has Foxe been *printed faithfully*, but most of *his* errors *corrected*,") will reply to a good deal in a way not very pleasant to the subscribers, who have first to pay for them, and then for having them inserted into their books. I presume, that the publication of a book requiring such correction is a novelty in the annals of literature. We must, however, keep in mind this pledge, as well as that given long since by the publishers, "Lists of the errata, which have been detected, will *of course* be given<sup>2</sup>." Such a supplement as will thus be made will indeed render the work what the Editor quaintly, but with remarkable propriety, calls "*perfect in its kind*;" and will, I trust, go far to vindicate what in the mean time he amuses himself, and tries to keep his subscribers quiet, by describing as cavils and aspersions.

Secondly, though Mr. Cattley does not choose to specify or dispute any one point mentioned in my Letter, yet he thinks it right to show, that in some one thing that I have said relating to Fox I am

---

<sup>1</sup> P. 493.

<sup>2</sup> Letter of Messrs. Seeley and Burnside in Brit. Mag. for Oct. 1837. See Six Letters, p. 61.



ignorant and mistaken ; and thinking that he has found what suits his purpose in my “Review of Fox’s Account of the Waldenses,” he says :—

“Mr. Maitland commenced his attack upon Foxe and his authorities, in a review of Foxe’s history of the Waldenses in the Acts and Monuments ; which review was published in 1837. As the Editor is not defending the Waldenses, but vindicating Foxe in his new edition but old costume, it is not his intention to enter upon the general question, but to confine himself rather to more concise and less lengthy matter. He is willing to allow Mr. Maitland the palm to which he is justly entitled, as being an acute scholar and an able and sarcastic critic. But Mr. Maitland overreaches himself. In the above review \*, he gives Foxe’s account of one Arnulph, in the time of pope Honorius II †. He calls it ‘a fine story,’ and refers to a ‘plain tale’ which Mr. Maitland takes from Trithemius. He calls this latter a ‘poor foundation’ for Foxe’s story, and charges him with quoting Trithemius, while in reality he is translating a book of Illyricus, whose name, as an historian, he was backward to acknowledge. But, was the Editor of this edition to write critical notes upon every extract from the history of the church contained in divers ancient and divers different writers, all embodied in Foxe’s work ? As well might the Editor suppose that Mr. Maitland was conversant with every author, and every edition of every author, extant in Foxe’s time. Mr. Maitland, with all his erudition, has entrapped himself in his own snare ; *he* is not conversant, nor can the best scholar be supposed to be conversant, with every edition of every author ; and before he brings such charges as those which are heaped upon Foxe, his authorities, and his Editor, the latter would tell Mr. Maitland that the ‘fine story’ at which he sneers, and the ‘poor foundation’ which he expects he has crumbled beneath his literary tread,—yes, that this whole story which Foxe

\* P. 46.

† P. 182. vol. i. Foxe’s new edition.

is charged with having unwarrantably amplified, is found, almost word for word, as Foxe and his Editor have perpetuated it, in ‘*Wolffii Lectiones Memorabiles*\*,’ by whom it was also extracted from the ‘*Chronicon*’ of Trithemius†.” Vol. I. p. 491.

“ \* Tom. i. pp. 805, 806. edit. 1671.

“ † It appears from Fabricius, (*Biblioth. Mediæ et Inf. Latinitat.* tom. iv.) who has devoted rather a larger space than usual to the account of Trithemius, that there were two editions—the second much enlarged—of the ‘*Annales Hirsaugienses*,’ and it is not probable that both Flaccus (*sic*) and Wolfius would derive their information from a fabricated source. There was no necessity for invention ; materials were abundant both to them and for Foxe. We may add another testimony upon this Arnulphus of Brescia. ‘*Pro quâ doctrinâ non solum ab ecclesiâ Dei anathematis mucrone separatus, insuper etiam suspendio neci traditus. Quin et post mortem incendio crematus, atque in Tybrim fluvium projectus est.*’ ‘*Gerhohus Reicherspergensis*,’ anno 1155, lib. i. etc. ‘*Investigatione Antichristi*,’ quoted in ‘*Collectio Judiciorum de Novis Erroribus*, studio C. du Plessis d’Argentre,’ (Lutet. Paris. 1724,) tom. i. p. 27. Foxe, it may be added, lays no stress upon his being archbishop of Lyons, or not ; he merely mentions what some others had asserted,—it seems incorrectly,—and there leaves it, and no ‘fuss’ need have been made about such a casual statement on his part, as has been. More evidence may be seen in d’Argentre’s ‘*Collectio*.’

Now, in the first place, what has this to do in a defence of the new edition ? Are the charges against the Editor himself so unanswerable that he is obliged to intrude upon his kinsman’s province, and vindicate Fox from the charge of borrowing authorities ? The only thing that might have been expected from the Editor in this matter, was some apology for repeatedly mis-spelling the name of Trithemius, of whom he had probably never heard, and whom he always called Trithimius. But of this he says nothing.

However, here is Mr. Cattley's charge, and I am happy to think that it may be answered, not only without much trouble or discussion, but in a way perfectly intelligible to every reader. It is Mr. Cattley who has overreached himself by talking about editions of authors whom he never knew in any edition, or, what is more probable, who has been overreached (quite innocently, and with kind intention,) by somebody who knew a little, and very little, more than himself. If he, or his Mentor, had understood Fabricius, or understood the matter at all, he would have seen that I was acquainted with, and was actually quoting from, what he calls the "much enlarged" edition; for to what else could my reference, "*An.* 1128, *Tom.* I. p. 389," apply, but to what Fabricius calls the "*annales integri*," as they stand in the *St. Gal* edition of 1690? It is amazing to see with what assurance the bolts of ignorance are shot. Mr. Townsend issues forth at once a broad contradiction, and sets me before his readers as an ignorant blunderer, telling them Fox could not copy from Illyricus, because he published this account of the Waldenses before Illyricus published his book, and that it is more likely that Illyricus copied from Fox. It is true that he afterwards gets some idea that the blunder is his own, and endeavours, more than fifty pages after, to correct it by another, at the same time quietly withdrawing the specific blunder on which he had grounded his con-



tradiction and his argument, and saying as little as possible about them <sup>1</sup>.

But, says Mr. Cattley, the story about Arnulphus is in "Wolfii Lectiones." I dare say it is. What silly story is not in that absurd farrago? Mr. Cattley will sadly overreach himself if he takes it for granted that every book with a Latin title, of which he has never heard before, contains unmixed truth. To be sure it is in Wolfii Lectiones, and so is the story of the French pig with a man's face, who had something the advantage of Arnulphus in point of time, and is still more honoured by Wolfius, who has favoured us with his portrait. Of course the story of Arnulphus is in Wolfius; and that ingenious writer also blunders him with Arnold of Brescia; and has, I suppose, led Mr. Cattley's informant to do the same, and to write nonsense about D'Argentré and Gerhohus Reicherspergensis, which requires no notice; being altogether irrelevant.

The reader will bear in mind that this question, whether Fox really copied from the books to which he refers, or took his references at second hand, is one with which Mr. Cattley is not particularly concerned. No charge was made against him, or his edition, on that point. That any person of moderate information can doubt that Fox was copying from Illyricus, I cannot believe; and in support of

<sup>1</sup> See note A.

that opinion I mentioned another instance, where Fox gives "the Sentence of the Council of Brixia against Pope Hildebrand," actually including a few words of Illyricus, which he had interpolated, but confined in a parenthesis. This passage was adduced as showing that Fox, who gave us the words, parenthesis and all, was copying from Illyricus; and it was also noticed by the way, that in the new edition the parenthesis had been removed, and so the words which had been contained in it had been merged in the text, in such a way as to seem as if they formed a part of the original document. This, of course, looks as absurd as it would to find in the midst of a version of some proclamation by a middle-age king of France, "and, further, forasmuch as an evil custom hath of a long season obtained in our good city of Paris, and in divers other cities, towns, and castles within our realms, as Mr. Hallam justly observes in his *Middle Ages*, whereby our good citizens of our said city, and other our subjects, are greatly annoyed," &c.

It is to this that Mr. Cattley refers in what immediately follows the passage just quoted from his defence; and it is worth while to give this continuation of his remarks, because it lets us a little into his notions of right and wrong. I cannot but think that it savours of lax morality, to say that a man may appropriate matter and crib references without acknowledgment, *provided* it turns out that the man

from whom he cribs them was an honest man, and took them faithfully. If the passage is really in Abbas Urspergensis, Fox was not called on to say that he only knew it in Illyricus. One likes to know the principles of those with whom one is dealing, and here are Mr. Cattley's words:—

“ But in the same review \*, Mr. Maitland again charges Foxe with suppressing the name of Illyricus †. Foxe had no need to mention Illyricus here, any more than he had in the case just cited when he quoted Trithemius ; for, excepting the parenthesis, ‘ for he took away the marriage of priests,’ which has given Mr. Maitland so much offence because of its inadvertent removal, or rather of its being merged into the text, in this new edition, the whole passage which is derived professedly from the ‘ Chronicon Abbatis Urspergensis,’ will be found there ‡. Now when the tartness of Mr. Maitland's remarks is coupled with the evident partiality of his statements,—not to say the unfairness, and, in some instances, the incorrectness of his criticisms,—the reader will be better prepared to judge of the merits of the case, and to allow a due proportion of praise to the acuteness of the reviewer, and another due portion also to the editor of Foxe, for his labour and travail.”—Vol. I. p. 492.

“ \* Page 51. “ † Vol. I. p. 133. “ ‡ Page 127, edit. Argent. 1537.”

I have no idea what proportion of praise Mr. Cattley would claim for his labour and travail, in removing the parenthesis, but I do not wish to deprive him of what is due <sup>1</sup>.

Thirdly, Mr. Cattley says some things respecting the new edition, which require notice.

---

<sup>1</sup> See Note B.

“The plan of proceeding adopted by the Editor was to collate together the original Latin edition of Foxe’s history, and the five authentic English editions. No time for delay or for verification of facts and authors was allowed,—none indeed seemed necessary in that which was professedly to be a mere *reprint* of an ancient book. When the work was announced, many gentlemen kindly offered their assistance in the prosecution of it, which was declined. The reason was, that if the mere *reprint* had been adhered to, such aid was unnecessary. The new edition would have been retarded in its progress had many editors been employed, and the same tedious delay would have attended the publication of each of the early volumes as has attended the one just produced. But had the Editor, when his second and third volumes first appeared, been aware that any of the public would have exclaimed—‘True, we subscribed to a reprint of Foxe, but upon perusing this portion now before us, we think we should have preferred a corrected edition, an edition illustrated with numerous notes, explanatory and critical,’—the Editor would indeed have been glad to have secured the aid which was kindly offered him.”—p. 484.

The falsehood of this statement is obvious, and its effrontery quite startling. *The book never was a mere reprint*; nor will Mr. Cattley persuade those subscribers who have the opportunity of comparing their copies with any old edition, *that it was ever meant to be one*—at least, if that ever was intended, the idea must have been abandoned before a single page of the new edition was published; and therefore, of course, before “any of the public” had exclaimed anything. The first published volume shows that the editor *meant to give, and thought he was giving*, a “corrected edition” with “numerous notes;” and so



far as I know of any public exclamation concerning him, it was chiefly against his “corrections” and his “notes,” by which too often the text was anything but corrected and illustrated.

Mr. Cattley tells us that,

“The pledge given to the publishers and to the public was, that *no typographical alteration* should be made in the matter or *style* of Foxe, but that he should appear *precisely* in his own shape, however rude, and in his *own words*, however characteristic of the age in which he lived; that *no roughness should be smoothed down*, and *no names altered*; and it was not till *long after* the Editor had lost his patience, and feared that he should lose his credit, that he was constrained to emancipate himself, in some degree, from the trammels in which his own admiration of Foxe, and that of others, had unhappily chained him.”—p. 486.

How long Mr. Cattley’s patience might last in a business which his unfitness for it must have rendered very irksome, I cannot tell; but certainly any such pledge as he specifies must have been speedily broken<sup>1</sup>. From this *very beginning* “typographical

<sup>1</sup> The publishers, in the notice prefixed to the volume just published, tell us, that “Between their resolving on the publication, and the actual commencement of the printing, very few weeks elapsed. *The only* thing then aimed at, was, to give FOXE’S HISTORY, *as correctly as possible, in the state in which he left it*. On the appearance, however, of Volumes II. and III., *printed on this system*, an attack was made upon them,” &c. So that, if we may believe the publishers, Mr. Cattley’s patience endured through two volumes. It is not, however, my intention to make the parties in this business responsible for the statements of each other. The reader may have observed the “ex-

alterations" were made with the utmost freedom; Fox's words, characteristic of the age in which he lived, were changed without the least notice, notes were numerous, and names were altered in abundance. Take the very first sentence printed by Mr. Cattley as it stands in the edition of 1583:—

"Now remayneth likewise as before I did in describing, the discent and diuersitie of the seuen kings altogether rainging and ruling in this land, so to prosecute in like order the lineal succession of *them*, which after Egbert King of Westsaxones, gouerned and ruled *soly*, untill the conquest of William the Normand: first expressing their names and afterward *importing* such acts as in their tyme happened in the church worthy to be noted."—p. 135.

Now let us see how this passage stands in the new edition, where it is, as I have said, the very first sentence of the work that Mr. Cattley printed:—

"Now remaineth *for me to do* as before I did in describing

---

treme hurry of printing," for instance, of which Mr. Cattley talks, p. 485, his announcement prefixed to the first published volume that "*some months* must necessarily elapse before the publication of the *first* volume, containing the Prefaces, Indexes," &c., the italic emphasis which the publishers give to the desire of "*immediate publication*" in their Notice to which I have just referred, and their "hope" expressed in their Prospectus that the volumes would be delivered to the subscribers "one every second month"—but how is this to be reconciled with Mr. Townsend's statement; "I was informed that *three years* would probably elapse before the preface would be required?" Letter to ——— Esquire, p. 2. That is, before the publishers would even want the manuscript from the author.

the descent and diversity of the seven Kings, *together* reigning and ruling in this land *namely*, to prosecute in like order the lineal succession of *those, who*, after Egbert, king of *the* West Saxons, governed and ruled *alone*, until the conquest of William the Norman; first expressing their names, and afterwards *recording* such acts, as in their time happened in the Church worthy to be noted."

This may be "corrected;" it may or may not be a great improvement on what Fox wrote; I am not criticising it: but if this is to be called a "mere reprint," I 'know not what those words mean. I have no idea that the sentence which I have quoted is more tampered with, and altered, than any other that one might light upon in carelessly opening the book. I believe, that this sort of wanton ignorant tampering with the text began with the very beginning of the work, and has been carried through it; and that by indulging in this taste for what he thought correction, the editor has often changed the meaning of passages which he did not understand. Of this I have given abundant proof in my Letters, and further evidence will be found in these pages. I do not believe that Mr. Cattley can produce from his first published volume, *one single page* of Fox's writing of which it can be said, without palpable falsehood, that "no typographical alteration" has been made in the "matter or style of Fox."

Again, what he says of a pledge that Fox "should appear precisely in his own shape, however rude, and in his *own words*, however characteristic of the age in which he lived," is manifestly untrue. He had

said something like it in the notice prefixed to the second (the first published) volume—"a few coarse expressions of a less cultivated age are either omitted or remodelled; but" [he adds in *italics*] "*these are carefully distinguished* by the insertion of the mark† in the margin." But this is not true. Such expressions had been changed without the slightest hint of alteration before the editor had reprinted three pages of the edition of 1583. For instance, the text in that edition reads;—

"And here next now followeth and commeth in, the whore of Babylon (rightly in her true colours by the permission of God, and manifestly without all tergiversation) to appeare to the whole world: and that not onely after the spiritual sense, but after the very letter, and the right form of *an whore indeed*. For after this Leo above-mentioned, the Cardinals proceeding to their ordinary election (after a solemne Masse of the Holy Ghost, to the perpetual shame of them and of that sea) instead of a man pope, elected a *whore* in deed to minister sacraments, to say masses, to geue orders . . . . . By Benedictus the iii. who succeeded next in the *whorish* sea, was first ordained," &c.  
—p. 137.

In the new edition it stands thus;—

"And here next now followeth and cometh in the whore of Babylon [Rev. xix. 2.] (rightly, in her true colours, by the permission of God, and manifestly without all tergiversation) to appear to the whole world: and that not only after the spiritual sense, but after the very letter, and the right form. For after this Leo above-mentioned, the cardinals, proceeding to their ordinary election (after a solemn Mass of the Holy Ghost, to the perpetual shame of them and of that see), instead of a man pope elected a *woman* to minister sacraments, to say masses, to give



orders, . . . . . By Benedict III. who succeeded next in the *Romish* see, was first ordained," &c.—p. 10.

And as to notes—does Mr. Cattley mean to say that the *first published* volume does not contain at least an hundred and fifty, signed “ED.”?

As to names too—it was certainly a strange “pledge given to the publishers, and to the public”—it was a strange thing for the editor of a “mere reprint” to bind himself that there should be “no names altered.” What could have put it into his head to enter into such an engagement? Whatever it might be, Mr. Cattley knows full well how soon, and how frequently it was broken; and what he can mean by representing that a clamour was raised which required him to alter names I know not. One of the heaviest charges against him was, that he altered the names of places so as to puzzle all history, and turn the world upside down. That he altered, for instance, *Tournon* into *Turin*, pp. 196, 312, instead of letting it alone, or translating it into *Tours*. That, repeatedly he changed *Aquisgrane* into *Aquitaine* instead of *Aix-la-Chapelle* (pp. 457, 468, 663). That he turned *Augusta* into *Augsburgh*, instead of *Aosta* (p. 144). That instead of letting *Boloine* stand, or accommodating “the general reader” by spelling it *Bowillon*, he made it *Bologna* (p. 143). That he changed *Munster* into *Mons* (p. 157), &c.<sup>1</sup> One of the earliest noticed alterations in

<sup>1</sup> See Letters, p. 12.

the book was his *designedly* changing "*Minerius*" into "*Reinerius*" (p. 270). (*Review of Fox*, p. 40.)

All this was before the public had exclaimed any thing. All this was in the *first volume* <sup>1</sup>.

<sup>1</sup> In order still further to expose the gross affectation of the Editor and publishers in pretending so to misunderstand the charge brought against their work, I subjoin an extract from the Letter which I published in the "*British Magazine*" for November 1837, in reply to the "*fears*" expressed by the publishers, that in "*reprinting at a rapid rate so peculiar a work as Foxe,*" some errors should have been "*left uncorrected.*" I endeavoured to answer plainly, "The charge against their edition is not (as they would insinuate) that, either from haste, or any other cause, they have '*left uncorrected*' the errors of the old edition, though it is true that they have done so to a most amazing extent—but it is not merely, or principally, with the '*retention of errors*' that their edition is charged. The charge is, that, though with no ill intention, the text of Fox has been *studiously depraved*—not merely that a bad text has been followed, but that it has been *industriously deteriorated*; and that beside this *many notes* have been added, misstating Fox's meaning, and tending to mislead the reader; in short, that while they boast of '*the production of a good edition,*' one that is '*by far the best edition of Foxe—the most complete, the most accurate—that has ever been produced,*' they are in fact bringing out a *bad* edition; and as far as my knowledge of two or three of the older editions enables me to judge, I think I may add, incomparably the *worst* that has ever been printed. It is easy to try this question. *Let the editor give a list of the corrections* which he made in the second and third volumes, (for they are principally in question, and I have scarcely had leisure to look much at the fourth,) and let us see what proportion they bear to the instances which I have given, in which he has clearly and palpably *incorrected* Fox, and made a blunder where there was

Fourthly, I must notice Mr. Cattley's proposal of a partnership. He tells the story in the following manner:—

“Previous to the publication of the volume now before the world, the Editor thought himself bound to write to Mr. Maitland, stating that an appendix would be prepared for each volume, and requesting him to supply any hints by the adopting of which this object might be more completely realized. The Editor regretted that an error \*, over which he had no control, had placed Mr. Maitland rather in the light of a critic than in that of an assistant. He stated how valuable Mr. Maitland's services would have been, as a scholar conversant with all the difficulties of ecclesiastical history; and to this application the Editor looked forward with pleasure to a reply. From the 1st of May to the 13th, 1839, Mr. Maitland was meditating what to do. After his

“\* The Editor may be under a false impression with regard to this offer of Mr. Maitland, which was a verbal one, communicated through a friend.”

---

none before. I am quite prepared to meet such a list of corrections by a recapitulation of the numerous cases which I have pointed out, and the addition of many more. If this is not done, and if the result does not show that *the blunders now for the first time inserted into the work* are trifling both in number and magnitude when compared with those which have been corrected, it will be suspected that the publishers really ‘fear’ something more than they have chosen to express.”—Letters, p. 68.

I need hardly say that this offer was not accepted. At that time, only three volumes out of eight had been published, and if the publishers had dared to let their subscribers know the nature and amount of the errata, which are, “of course,” to be published, it is likely that a good many of them would have refused to pay five more half-guineas, if they did not ask for a return of the three already paid.

manner of speaking of the Editor, he actually discredited the genuineness of the letter. He could not conceive that one upon whose labours he had lavished such dispraise, could really write to him as one gentleman would to another! He could see no harmony between the tartness of his own observations and the civility of the note which he had received! He therefore went to the Publishers, and having actually ascertained that the signature affixed to the note was really that of the Editor, he retired back into the quiet recesses of Lambeth Palace, and penned a reply, which the Editor of course has not requested permission to make public, but from which a single extract will be enough. Having stated that 'silence is liable to misconstruction;' having stated the doubts which he entertained as to the genuineness of the letter which the Editor wrote to him; he winds up with these words, stating 'plainly, but without the wish to give you personal offence, that your proceedings, as the editor of Fox, appear to me so discreditable, that I do not wish to enter into any private correspondence with you.' After this reply, the Rev. S. R. Cattley felt much satisfaction in proceeding with his Appendices without the assistance of the Rev. S. R. Maitland." Vol. I. p. 494.

As the letters are but brief, it may be as well to give them entire.

*"Fulham, May 1, 1839.*

"Dear Sir,

"As I intend shortly to prepare some brief Appendix for each of the volumes of Foxe's Acts and Monuments, of which I am the Editor, I take the liberty of asking you to supply me with any hints, by the adoption of which this object may be more completely realized.

"From your public observations upon the early volumes, I imagine that you have carefully perused some portions of the work; and I regret that by an error, over which I had no controul, you had to appear rather as a critic, than as an assistant. I regret this the more, because, though the publication would



have been delayed, your able assistance as a scholar, and as one conversant with the difficulties of Ecclesiastical History, would have been extremely valuable to me.

“ I shall therefore trust that you will favour me with a notice of errors or proposed emendations, by which the work may be improved, and that I may be permitted to make an avowal of your suggestions on this behalf.

“ I am, dear Sir,

“ Yours faithfully,

“ STEPHEN REED CATTLEY.”

---

“ *Lambeth, May 13th, 1839.*

“ Reverend Sir,

“ I feel that silence is liable to misconstruction, and therefore, had I been satisfied of the genuineness of the letter which I received on the 2nd instant, I should have earlier stated (plainly, but without the wish to give you personal offence,) that your proceedings as the Editor of Fox appear to me so discreditable, that I do not wish to enter into any private correspondence with you on the subject. I am,

“ Reverend Sir,

“ Your obedient Servant,

“ S. R. MAITLAND.”

It will be observed that Mr. Cattley's letter was not written until after the *eighth* volume of Fox was published. At no time during the publication of the book had he, so far as I know, taken any specific notice of any one error that I pointed out, or treated any thing like criticism of his work, either by myself or others, with any thing but ostentatious contempt. Indeed I do not know that he had ever afforded (perhaps I may say had been allowed to afford) to

the subscribers any hint that “cavils” had been raised against himself, or his book, until the publication of the *fifth* volume. In the mean time he stood quietly by, while the publishers took up the cudgels (which I presume they did not venture to trust in his hands), and said things of me which were more excusable, as coming from tradesmen whose wares were spoken of with disrespect, than if they had come directly from himself. This is not the usual course of things among gentlemen; especially as it was acknowledged that the publishers were doing their part very handsomely, and were blameable only for persisting in the employment of such an editor. But so it was that the publishers took the defence into their own hands; and when Mr. Rose rebuked them for what appeared to his honourable mind the meanness of representing my letter as anonymous, they seemed quite surprised, and felt themselves hardly used, and intimated that, considering who the person was, it was something like an act of candour and forbearance to talk of what I had written as if it were anonymous, rather than to mention my name in the business. In this I presume Mr. Cattley acquiesced; and in perfect harmony with this, when the fifth volume came out, some months afterwards, he prefixed the following advertisement:—

“The Editor regrets the delay which has attended the publication of the present volume, arising from a necessary reference to many hundred authors and originals, in order to render it more acceptable to the public.

“ The Editor feels confident that this assurance will satisfy his own and Foxe’s friends. To all others he takes this opportunity of stating, that the cavils raised against himself, and this Edition of the Acts and Monuments, will be best responded to, not by adopting the language, or by animadverting upon the motives of the assailants, but by noticing, in the Appendix, the alleged causes of their aspersions.

“ FULHAM, *January 20, 1838.*

“ ERRATA.

“ P. 35, l. 15. ‘ Gunwell-hall ;’ a corruption of Gonville-hall, the old title of Gonville and Caius College.

“ P. 47, note. For ‘ Anjou,’ read ‘ Angers.’ Also at page 54, line 18, the same.

“ P. 54, l. 17. For ‘ faculties of decrees,’ read ‘ faculty of decrees’ [meaning, faculty of the canon law].”

Now if Mr. Cattley did not mean me, and did not mean to speak the language not merely of defiance, but of insult, it will be easy for him to say whom and what he did mean. Was it not intended to let me and my friends and the whole universe know, that it was his intention (as he phrases it) to notice the alleged causes of my aspersions, and chastise me very horribly in some Appendix ? Could I expect that he would ask me to join in writing that Appendix ? Was it possible that one who had, *to say the least*, quietly acquiesced in the statement that my name was discredit, and who had described my attempts at criticism as mere cavils and aspersions, and who was nursing his wrath to let it loose in an Appendix, would propose a partnership in writing that very Appendix ?

Mr. Cattley is quite right in saying that I “actually discredited the genuineness of the letter.” I was as entirely unacquainted with Mr. Cattley’s handwriting as I am at this moment with his person; and knowing how much mirth his labours had created among some of my friends and acquaintance, I thought it not quite impossible that the letter might be a joke; and that by sending an answer to Mr. Cattley, I might seem guilty of incivility to him, and get laughed at into the bargain. I should have been glad for Mr. Cattley’s sake to have found that it had been so. He is wrong in saying that I “went to the publishers,” as well as in saying that from the 1st to the 13th of May I was meditating what to do. I did not go to the publishers; and during the interval which elapsed before I replied, I was occupied in many other ways than in meditating on his letter. I do not mean to make what he calls a “fuss” about what he would probably describe as a “casual statement,” which, I suppose, means what a person says off-hand for convenience, without particularly knowing, or caring, whether it is true or false; but want of principle, and of due regard for truth, are as distinctly shown in this species of careless falsification as in almost any thing. I received Mr. Cattley’s letter (as I stated in my reply) not on the 1st, but on the 2nd of May. How soon it went out of my possession I really do not know, nor do I feel called on to say where it went to; but from the cover in which it was returned to me, and in which it now lies before me,



I have no doubt that it came back to me on the 13th of May, and was on that day answered. While out of my possession it had, by my direction, been shown to one of the publishers, simply with a view to ascertain whether it really was Mr. Cattley's writing.

Nor does it appear that I was over-cautious ; for if what Mr. Cattley says is true, (the little trippings which I have just noticed lead me to speak hypothetically,) it looks as if something like the trick which I supposed might have been practised on me, had actually been played on him. What can he mean by my "offer?" If, as he seems to say, any "friend," either of his or mine, (I am not aware that we had a single acquaintance in common,) has ever made any communication of any kind to Mr. Cattley in my name, or professedly on my behalf, let him be *named* ; and let him explain what is to me altogether unintelligible.

Whether Mr. Cattley's conduct as Editor had been creditable or otherwise, people will form their own opinions. I am glad that Mr. Townsend has publicly stated his concurrence in mine. "I deemed it to be the duty of the Editor to refute or to acknowledge the errors which were thus affirmed respecting his labours<sup>1</sup>." So did a good many other people ; and if Mr. Townsend always thought so, it is a pity, for his own sake, that he did not say it before. He has preferred to continue connected with the edition, and it is not a sentence or two of disclaimer, now

<sup>1</sup> Letter to ———, Esq. p. 3.

that the work is published and paid for, that will divest him of the responsibility incurred by allowing the use which has been made of his name for so many years.

Having offered these preliminary observations, I proceed to mention some things which I have noticed in the work which may furnish hints for the Appendix. It is not my intention to repeat here the notice which I have furnished of various errors in my Letters, though perhaps a repetition may occur; and I must repeat (for I find I cannot say it too often) that these hints are not the result of laborious examination and collation, but are such things as I have lighted on in casually dipping into the book.

First of all I will notice some of the Editor's notes, which, as they require no particular classification, I will place in the order of the volumes, and begin each with a reference to the page where it occurs, for the convenience of any subscriber who may oblige me by referring to the work, and testing the accuracy of my statements.

As the second and third volumes are stated by the publishers to have been published on the "system" of giving "Foxe's History, as correctly as possible, in the state in which he left it," and as it does not appear very clear what is going to be done with them in the cancels, I should go at once to those which they state to have been brought out "under a different system of revision," were it not that there is one note in the third volume<sup>1</sup> which certainly ought to be cancelled,

<sup>1</sup> Page 315.

but which I do not think the Editor has taken any recent measures to correct, because he could scarcely have referred to the original document, which is in my keeping, without my knowledge. If he has long since prepared a cancel or a correction, my anticipation of it will do no harm. The note is appended to the account of the penance imposed by Archbishop Courtenay on some tenants of the see who refused to render the service which was due from them, and which was the equivalent for rent. Fox tells the story thus:—

“To express, moreover, and describe, the glorious pomp of these prince-like prelates, in these blind days of popish religion reigning then in the Church, I thought to adjoin hereunto another example not much unlike, neither differing much in time, concerning certain poor men cited up, and enjoined strait penance by William Courtney, predecessor of the said Thomas Arundel, for bringing litter to his horse, not in wains, as they should do, but in privy sacks, in a secret manner under their cloaks or coats: for which so heinous and horrible trespass, the said archbishop, sitting in his tribunal seat, did call and cite before him the said persons, (*pro littera*, i. e. for litter, after his own Latin,) and, after their submission, enjoined them penance; which penance what it was, and what were the names of the aforesaid parties, here followeth out of the said archbishop’s registers, both by his own words, and by picture of the persons in the same registers annexed and painted, in all resemblance, as there standeth, and here also to be seen.” Vol. III. p. 315.

Now, what but the weak, bitter spirit of levelling puritanism could make Foxe so represent this transaction, if he really understood it? The simple fact (obvious from the sentence which I shall quote pre-

sently) is, that certain tenants who held lands and tenements of the see of Canterbury by the tenure of furnishing hay and straw for the archbishop's horses, refused or evaded the performance of their "due service." They were not asked to be "good to my lord grace's horse," but to pay their rent. They were willing tenants holding lands and tenements in consideration of certain payments, which payments they dishonestly refused or evaded, and on being cited before the archbishop, they acknowledged their offence, and the punishment which he enjoined them was, that on the next Sunday, when the procession should be made in the Church of their parish, they should walk in it bare-headed, and bare-footed, with sacks of hay and straw on their shoulders<sup>1</sup>. There are persons to whom this will seem very

<sup>1</sup> I apprehend that this sort of penance in kind, if I may so call it, was not uncommon at a very much later period. Strype gives us (among the *detecta et comperta*) in the metropolitical visitation of the diocese of Lincoln, by Cardinal Pole, in 1556, an account of two men who did penance in Fox's native town by carrying quarters of lamb on their shoulders in the market, for having eaten meat on a fast day.

"Anthonius Strailes et Ric'us Langrake comederunt carnes quodam die Sab'ti. xxvii. die Julii anno Dni. predict. comparuerunt d'ci Anthonius et Ric'us; et fatentur artic'lum, ac penitentie se humiliter submiserunt. Quibus juratis Dns. injunxit penitere in hunc modum. Q<sup>d</sup> d'ci Anthonius et Ric'us in publico mercato apud Boston circumferant sup. humeris suis induti linthiamen, nudis pedibus et capite, unum quarterium agni, viz. *Le a lambs quarter*." Stry. Mem. vol. iii. part ii. p. 409.



“strait penance” for cheating an archbishop; but to myself it does not appear very unmerciful, and I do not discern any “glorious pomp” in it. To come, however, to the Editor’s note.

“The registers of the archbishops of Canterbury, of which Foxe so wisely availed himself in compiling his Acts and Monuments of the Church, remain to this day indisputable proofs of his own veracity, and most instructive memorials of the pride and oppression of the Church of Rome. The illustration on the opposite page differs slightly from that which is given by our author; it is, nevertheless, an exact copy from archbishop Courtney’s Register, which, by the obliging permission of his grace the archbishop of Canterbury, the Editor was enabled to take, from the original document at Lambeth. Foxe adjoins to his illustration, the following verses, which must not be understood as forming an extract from the Register, but were probably the production of his own pen :—

‘ This bag full of straw, I bear on my back,  
Because my lord’s horse his litter did lack ;  
If ye be not good to my lord grace’s horse,  
Ye are like to go barefoot before the cross.’

The superscription in the archbishop’s Register is as follows :—‘ *Injunctio pœnitentiæ tenentibus domini, in non portando sufficientem quantitatem fœni et straminis.*’—ED.”

It is quite clear that for any man to write thus, without having made a considerable collation of Fox’s extracts and translations with the Registers, would be a fraud on his readers. How much he has done in this way Mr. Cattley will, perhaps, inform us. In the mean time, this note, and the extract to which it belongs, show us that we should not be likely to gain much by his undertaking such a business. It is true, that in the margin of the Register there is such a picture as he gives, and over it, in a hand comparatively modern,

with respect to both Archbishop Courtenay and to Fox, there is a superscription which the Editor has attempted to copy. I do not wonder that one who could write "vide epistolam viginti," or "ex libro Wigornensis," and the like<sup>1</sup>, should be satisfied to give such unintelligible words as "in non portando," but they should be altered to "ni, [i. e. nostri,] non curando;" nor do I wonder that he could not understand or translate the twenty lines of Latin which he gives us in the next page, and which Fox professes to give from Archbishop Courtenay's Register.

I will here give them as they stand in the edition of 1583, p. 555, inserting between brackets some of the more important corrections, which a collation with the original suggests.

"Erroris mater ignorantia, quosdam Hugonem Pennie, Johannem Forstall, Johannem Boy, Johannem Wanderton, Gulielmum Hayward, et Johannem White, tenentes domini de Wengam taliter obcœcavit, quod ante adventum dicti domini archiepiscopi ad palatium suum Cantuariæ in vigilia dominice<sup>2</sup> in ramis palmarum, Anno Domini millesimo trecentesimo nonagesimo, de cariendo<sup>3</sup> [*curando*] et ducendo ad dictum palatium, fœnum, stramen, sive literam, prout ex tenura terrarum, et tenura [*tenementorum*] suorum quas et quæ tenent de domino et ecclesia sua Cantuariæ astringuntur, per ballium domini ibidem jussi et legitime præmoniti debita servitia more solito impendere dedignantur stramen hujusmodi non in carrucis et

<sup>1</sup> See Letters, p. 16.

<sup>2</sup> The new edition has *dominica*. I suspect that the editor altered the letter *e*, (not recognizing it as the usual representative of the *æ* in the days of Abp. Warham,) into *a*, to make it agree with *vigilia*.

<sup>3</sup> This mistake is, in the new edition, altered to *ceriendo*.

vehiculis publice [*et*] in sufficienti quantitate, sed modice in saccis sub latibulo, pontificis [*portantes*] ad palatium prædictum perduxerunt, in vilipendium domini ac subtractionem : jurium ecclesiæ suæ Cantua. Unde super hoc evocati coram domino, [*coram domino evocati,*] die Jovis in hebdomada Paschæ in castro suo de Statewode [*Saltnode*] pro tribunali sedente personaliter comparentes, ipsius judicio in hac parte se humiliter submiserunt, veniam et misericordiam pro commissis devote petendo. Et deinde dominus præfatus, [*præfatos*] Hugonem Pennie, Johannem Forstall, Johannem Boy, Johannem Wanderton, Gulielmum Hayward, et Johannem White, de stando mandatis ecclesiæ, et fideliter peragendo pœnam [*pœnitentiam*] eis pro eorum demeritis injungendam, juratos absolvit in forma juris, nunciata [*injuncta*] eis et eorum cuilibet, pro modo culpæ pœna [*pœnitentia*] salutari : videlicet, quod die dominica tunc proxime sequente, prædicti pœnitentes nudi capita et pedes, processionem apud ecclesiam collegiatam de Wengham faciendam cum singulis saccis super humeris suis palam portantes (plenis videlicet fœno et stramine) ita quod stramen et fœnum hujusmodi ad ora saccorum patentium intuentibus prominerent, lentis incessibus procederent humiliter et devote.—*Ex regist. W. Courtney.*"

Now, I think it must be admitted, that a person who could make such an extract is not to be trusted; and the nature of the mistakes is such as to show that Fox was not competent to read old manuscripts; "Prout ex tenura terrarum et tenura suorum quas et quæ tenent de domino," is a sentence which might surely have suggested whether the contraction "ten.," which followed "terrarum et," was properly resolved by "tenura," even to a reader who had not learned to associate "lands and tenements." It is quite clear that the contractions, though neither very artificial nor unusual, puzzled Fox, and that he did not

know how to write out the words at length. Thus he guesses *port.* into *pontificis*, instead of *portantes*; *pfat.* into *præfatus*, instead of *præfatos*, and *pniam* into *pœnam* instead of *pœnitentiam*. Whether the change of *Saltwode* into *Statewode* was meant for wit, or whether it was only that, like other words which I have noticed, he did not make out the writing, I do not know.

Vol. IV. p. 239, are some extracts from the Register of Bishop Longland, respecting the persecution in his diocese of Lincoln. In them we find a paragraph beginning, "Sir John, a priest, and also Robert Robinson, detected Master Cotismore of Brightwell," &c. The Editor's note is "'Sir John,' or 'Sir John Lacklatin,' a term of derision for the lower orders of the popish clergy.—ED." Did Mr. Cattley really believe that the Bishop of Lincoln, or his Registrar, adopted this "term of derision" in recording the acts of the clergy in the register of the diocese?

Vol. IV. p. 363, it is stated, that after the sentence of degradation had been passed on John Castellane, priest, the Bishop of Nicopolis proceeded to put it in execution. On the word "Nicopolis," the editor has put this brief note; "'Nicopolis,' Nicholas-du-Port.—ED." Will he give us some hint of his meaning?

Vol. IV. p. 373, it is stated, that the "Abbot of Clarilocus, and suffragan to the Bishop of Metz, suddenly, at the coming of the Duchess of Denmark into the city of Nancy, stricken with sudden fear at



the crack of the guns, fell down and died, as those who were present and saw it have made faithful relation of the same, A.D. 1525." The Editor's note is "'Clarilocus,' Clermont.—ED." Surely he might have begged or borrowed Latin and French enough to translate *Clarus-locus* into *Clair-lieu*, even if he had not any map to show that there was any place so named near to Nancy. Any inquiry respecting the truth of the story, he may perhaps consider as belonging to the province of his kinsman.

Vol. IV. p. 408 : it seems to me as if the Editor should have taken some notice of the note which Fox has given on this passage ; if, by the time that he had got thus far, he had abandoned the notion of a "mere reprint," and meant to correct errors. In a passage which I have quoted, he asks ; "Was the Editor of this edition to write critical notes upon every extract from the history of the Church contained in divers ancient and divers different writers, all embodied in Fox's work?" For several reasons, I should say certainly not ; but, at the same time, if he saw a note of Fox that was mere ignorant nonsense, I think it was part of his duty to put the general reader on his guard.

"Then the official asked, what he thought of holy oil, salt, with such other like? To whom the martyr answered, that all these things were a mere *Maranismus*, that is, they savoured of the law of *Maranorum*, and of the superstition of the Jews."

Fox seems to have thought that his readers would

require some explanation of this, and he has given them the following note:—

“Maranatha is a Hebrew word, mentioned 1 Cor. xvi., and signifieth curse and malediction to the loss of all that a man hath, and thereof cometh Maranismus : vid. Nic. Lyr.”

Mr. Townsend, while he concedes that Fox’s “acquaintance with the Jewish and rabbinical literature was not so extensive or profound as with the annals and erudition of Christian Churches,” adds, “still he had so competent a skill in the Hebrew language, as to become thoroughly acquainted with the Scriptures in the original language<sup>1</sup>.” He, therefore, will perhaps furnish a notice for the Appendix, showing that this note is all quite right, and very demonstrative of Fox’s Hebrew learning. It will not require more assurance, or manifest more ignorance, than to maintain that “*laneis vestibus*” is rightly translated by “thin garments.” But if he does not do this, I would propose some brief addition to the note, just to say that *Maranatha* means no such thing; that Nicholas de Lyra, (a Hebrew of the Hebrews,) would have been one of the last men in the world to say that it did, and that, supposing it to mean that, or any thing else, it has nothing to do with the matter in hand.

So much I think the Editor ought to do for the sake of those subscribers who are not as good

<sup>1</sup> Life of Fox, p. 53.

Hebraists as Fox is said to have been. Whether he may think it worth while to trace the cause of Fox's error in ascribing his own ignorance (which seems merely to have guessed at *maranatha* from some similarity of sound) to Nicholas de Lyra, or to attempt to explain what will probably be obscure to most readers, is for him to decide.

As to the first, I think he will find that Fox had got hold of and misunderstood Paulus Burgensis, when he supposed he was reading Nicholas de Lyra; but it is not worth while here to enter into that.

As to the second point; namely, what Claudius Monerius really meant by *maranismus* and *marranorum*, I do not take upon me to say positively, but I will offer a conjecture. The passage in which the words occur, is in Crispin's *Actiones*, 169. b. and in Pantaleon's continuation of Fox's Latin work of 1559, and stands thus, I believe, in both; "Ventum est ad oleum illud sacrum, salem, aliasque ejus generis nugas, quas aiebam merum esse *marranismum*. Hic cum viderem Officialem hæsitare in voce *marranismi* declaravi illi quid ea sibi vellet, dicens, istiusmodi unguenta et salsamenta prorsus redolere legem *marranorum* ac superstitionem Judaicam," p. 210. It may be presumed that Monier spoke French, and that this is a Latin translation of his words. What they might be I cannot exactly say; but I think I can tell what would have corresponded to it in the English of his time and party. An English puritan would have been very likely to tell

the official, that these things were “all *maumetrie*,” or “*mammetry*.” This the Editor has explained in a note at Vol. III. p. 327, to mean “Puppet or idol-worship;” which meaning, or something like it, it certainly came to have; but the original meaning of the word, or rather the word itself originally, was “Mahometry.” “We,” (says Selden, and it is to be wished that some other people were as candid in their acknowledgements while they are as base in their practice,) “charge the prelatical clergy with popery to make them odious, though we know that they are guilty of no such thing. Just as heretofore they called images *mammets*, and the adoration of images *mammetry*; that is, *Mahomet*, and *Mahometry*; odious names, when all the world knows the Turks are forbidden images by their religion<sup>1</sup>.” All the world might know this in Selden’s day, or he might think

<sup>1</sup> P. 90. I am indebted to Dr. Wordsworth for pointing out the passage of Selden, which he has given in a note on a declaration of Lord Cobham, that he who worshipped a dead image, committed the “greatest sin of *maumetrie*.” *Eccles. Biog.* Vol. I. p. 368. This saying of Lord Cobham’s stands in the new edition of Fox, “the greatest sin of *mammetry*.” Vol. III. 327; in the edition of 1576, it is “*maumetry*,” p. 538; but in the original English edition of 1563 it stands, “the abhominable sinne of *idolatry*,” p. 264. So it is in what I believe to be the original edition of Bale’s “Brief Chronicle,” p. 19. b. (xxx. 8. 16. 8°.); as, indeed, might be expected, seeing that Fox’s account of Lord Cobham is, with very few alterations, a reprint of Bale’s book. Such verbal differences as this which I have noticed, show that we must not too much rely on the precise language of the documents thus given to us.



that they did; but I doubt whether Fox had very clear ideas of Mahometanism. It may, perhaps, surprise some persons, even among those who make broad vouchers for Fox's accuracy, and for the documents which we owe to him, to find "Solyman the great Turk," in his letter to the master of Rhodes, first swearing by "God the maker of heaven and earth," and afterwards, "by our mighty God Mahomet, above all others to be worshipped." Vol. IV. p. 350.

But as to the perverse notion thus entertained of Mahometry by the uneducated, may it not have arisen from their seeing puppet exhibitions of Mahound and Termagaunt, till the origin of the name was lost, and it came to convey little idea but that of a puppet? Just as the vulgar in our day might ridicule grotesque images by calling them Punch and Judy, without thinking at all of Pontius Pilate or Judas Iscariot. The meaning of the word is however plain, and the next question is, why Monier called *Maumetrie*, *Marranismus*; and the answer, I suppose, is, that the schoolmaster of Lyons knew (though the official and Fox did not) that the Moors in Spain were called *Marrani*.

Vol. IV. p. 697. Bishop Tonsal, writing to Sir Thomas More about the publications of some whom he considered heretics, and whom he wished More to refute, says, "I send you here their own fond tryals in their own tongue." The Editor's note is neither more nor less than "Tryal; i. e. 'triatio,' old Latin, 'an endeavour.'"—ED. What can this mean; and what is the Editor's idea of "*old Latin*?"



Vol. V. p. 293. The text (at least in the edition of 1596, p. 1047. a. for I have not the 1583 at hand) has the words "lift up into heaven," (being in fact a translation of the words of Berengarius "*elevata in cœlum*<sup>1</sup>;" but the Editor having apparently collated this passage with an earlier edition than that from which he was reprinting, found in it "lyste up," a very common typographical error when printers used the long f, and the double letter ft might easily pass for ft. Obvious as this is, it does not appear to have occurred to the Editor; and he treats it as a various reading. But then, what meaning was to be assigned to it? Whoever heard of any thing being "lysted up?" and what could be meant by the body of Christ having been *lysted* up into heaven? I presume that the Editor made a meaning purely out of his own head, and wrote "Edit. 1570. 'Lyste up,' or limited to."—ED. Of course, it was rather an improvement of Berengarius's testimony about transubstantiation; but it ought in honesty as well as policy to be cancelled.

Vol. V. p. 406, there is a copy of verses so profane and irreverent, that one is surprised that those concerned in the new edition should have dared to reprint them. I may find another and more suitable place to speak of its loathsome ribaldry; but I here mention it merely with reference to two notes of the Editor. The first is on these lines:—

" There were we flocked,  
*Lownted* and mocked ;"

<sup>1</sup> Bib. Pat. VI. 198 E.

and the note tells us, “‘lowted,’ kneeled or bowed.—ED.” Here (as too often) the Editor seems to have been misled by his friend Nathan Bailey’s Dictionary, and might say in the words of Shakespeare, “I am *lowted* by a traitor villain!” Nares would have given him that passage in proof, that to ‘lout,’ means to make a ‘lout’ of anybody.

The other note is on this verse—

“ To Maister John Shorne,  
That blessed man borne ;  
For the ague to him we apply,  
Which juggleth with a *bote* :  
I beshrowe his herte rote  
That wyle truste him, and it be I !”

The note is “‘Bote,’ a recompence or fee.—ED.” Supposing that the word might sometimes or somewhere have some such meaning, yet it seems very unnatural to say that a man juggled *with* a recompence, when the writer of the verses might just as well have said that he juggled *for* one ; and the Editor’s note looks like the guess of ignorance, grounded on the notion, that if John Shorne juggled respecting those persons who went on pilgrimage to be cured of their ague, it was that he might get something. It may be worth while to add, that, by comparing two passages, of which the Editor does not appear to have seen the connexion, some light may be thrown on an obscure superstition. Nares says,—

“ SHORNE, M. JOHN, whoever he was, must have been an

eminent saint. In the *Four Ps*, the Palmer boasts that he had been at all famous shrines ; among the rest, ‘at mayster *Johan Shorne*, in Canterbury,’ *O. Pl.* i. 55. ‘He said he ware not the same [coat] since he came last from *Sir John Shorne*.’—*Legh’s Acced. of Armorie, Preface*. Latimer says, ‘Ye shall not think that I will speake of the popish pilgrimage, which we were wont to use in times past, in running hither and thither, to *M. John Shorne*, or to our Lady of Walsingham. No, no, I will not speake of such fooleries.’—*Latimer*, p. 186, b. Of his history or of his shrine, I have not been fortunate enough to learn anything more ; but, from his being called *Sir*, we may conjecture that he had been a priest of *Shorne*, in Kent.”

The going on pilgrimage to St. John Shorne is incidentally mentioned at pages 232 and 580 of the fourth volume of Fox, but in a way which throws no light on the subject. The verse which I have quoted, seems as if there was some relic which was supposed to cure the ague, and by which the ‘juggle’ was carried on. Now, another passage in this same fifth volume, p. 468, leads me to believe that this relic really was (and therefore the word ‘bote’ simply means) a ‘boot.’ In this passage we learn that one of the causes of “Robert Testwood’s trouble,” was his ridiculing the relics which were distributed to be borne by various persons in a procession ‘upon a relic Sunday.’ St. George’s dagger having been given to one Master Hake, Testwood said to Dr. Clifton, “Sir, Master Hake hath St. George’s dagger. Now, if he had his horse, and St. Martin’s cloak, and Master *John Shorne’s boots*, with King Harry’s spurs, and his hat, he might ride when he would.”

Vol. V. p. 627, we read, "Upon the next morning, the Lord Cardinal caused his servants to address themselves in their most *warlike* array, with *Jack*, knapskal, splent, spear, and axe, &c." On which the Editor's note is, "'Jack,' a leathern vessel for carrying water.—ED." What was there of warlike array in leather vessels for carrying water? If it was needful to look in a dictionary, Nares would have told him, "A horseman's defensive upper garment, quilted and covered with strong leather," &c.

Vol. V. p. 691. Fox tells us that the bishop of Winchester's exclusion from the executorship of Henry the Eighth's will was "to him no small *corsey*," and the Editor's note is, "'corsey,' a corruption of the Scotch word 'corses,' or money.—ED." What could he mean? Did he suppose that, as a matter of fact, Gardiner got "no small" money by being excluded from the executorship? How could he find or make so absurd an explanation? The word *corsey* is well enough known; and it, as well as *corsive* and *corzie*, is with great probability considered as a corruption of "corrosive." Be this as it may, Nares gives sufficient examples of its use to leave us in no doubt as to its meaning. "That same bitter *corsive* which did eat her tender heart."—*Spenser*. "Every cordiall that my thoughts apply, Turns to a *cor'sive*, and doth eat it farder."—*B. Jonson*. "His perplexed mother was driven to make him by force be tended, with extreme *corsey* to herselfe, and annoyance to him."—*Pembr. Arcad*.



Vol. VI. p. 216. Alexander Dering, Notary and Registrar under Master Cook, in the diocese of Winchester, being examined in the matter of Bishop Gardiner, declared, that after the king's visitation of the diocese, a letter was sent "to Master Chancellor, videlicet, Dr. Steward, for reformation of certain *comperts* in the visitation, wherein they," [the king's visitors] "had taken no order." The Editor's note is "'Comperts,' delegates in the civil law.—ED." Was there ever anything so unmeaning? what could the Editor suppose himself to mean? Will he cancel the note, and let his readers find out as they may what is meant by *comperts*, or will he tell them that the matters presented or found at visitations were technically called the "*Comperta et Detecta*," which were respectively Englished into *comperts* and *detects*<sup>1</sup>? Corresponding to these *comperta et detecta* were certain "*acta et habita*," which formed a very important part of a visitation; though it appears, that in the present case, what should have been had and done in respect of certain particular *comperts*, had been neglected.

Vol. VI. p. 421. Lady Jane Grey, in a letter to her father's chaplain, speaks of "Peter, Paul, Ste-

<sup>1</sup> We have just been reading that "Sir John, a priest, and also Robert Robinson, *detected* Master Cotismore;" and the phrase is often to be found in Fox. When All-Souls had been visited by commission, Archbishop Whitgift wrote "that he found also by the *detects* that," &c.—*Strype's Life of Whitgift*, vol. ii. p. 464, old ed. p. 557.



phen, and other apostles and holy martyrs in the beginning of the Church, as of good Simeo, Archbishop of Solyma, and Zetrophone, with infinite others under Sapor, the King of the Persians and Indians." Of course the Editor was not bound to have heard of Simeon, the martyred primate of Jerusalem, though Lady Jane had probably been brought up to consider him as the Son of Cleophas, the nephew of the blessed Virgin, and the brother of St. James the Less; but what a gratuitous ostentation of ignorance does it seem to put such a note as the following on the very word *Solyma*; "Simeo was Archbishop of *Seleucia* about A.D. 250.—ED." Why, suppose he had been, what had that to do with Simeon of *Jerusalem*? But the note is not merely irrelevant, but false. Simeon of Seleucia was not Archbishop about A.D. 250; at least, if he was, he must have held the see a long while; for it is I believe indisputable, that he was not martyred till more than ninety years after that time. It will be well to cancel this note, and substitute one on Zetrophone, about whom readers in general will be much more at a loss than about Simeon of Jerusalem.

Vol. VI. p. 501, we have Latimer's Protestation, of which Strype says<sup>1</sup>; "As Cranmer and Ridley had delivered in writing their sentiments or protestations upon the three questions propounded by the papists to them, to dispute on at Oxford; so old father

<sup>1</sup> Mem. III. i. 375.

Latymer also delivered his. A copy whereof, such as Fox could then procure, is recorded in his Acts and Monuments; but it is very imperfect, and many mistakes made, and many things omitted, as I find by a very good copy that I have met with among the Foxian MSS., and therefore I have placed it in the catalogue." (No. XXXIV.) The copy in Strype is nearly half as long again as in Fox; but I doubt whether it has always the more correct text. For instance, where Fox (New Ed. p. 502, l. 6,) reads "masters the *offerers*," it has "*officers*;" but on the other hand, when, five lines further on, Fox reads "master or offerer," Strype's copy is no doubt right in reading "masser." In line 44 of the same page, the making Latimer say, "I have spoken in my time before two kings more than *once*, two or three hours together," is, I suppose, a correction of the Editor, as the Fox of 1596 and Strype agree in reading "more than *one*, two, or three hours," though they differ in so far, as that Fox in the old edition agrees with the new in reading "together," while Strype reads "to either." But surely, if by the time they had got more than half through the sixth volume, all parties had begun to think that some attention to correctness was desirable, one might have expected that such a document, from such a man, with such a stigma as Strype had fixed on Fox's copy, and such easy means for its emendation, would have obtained some editorial care.

I am inclined to think that if we had a correct

copy, we should probably find that Latimer indulged in some play on the words "mafter" and "masser." Such as when in this same Protestation, he says, "Stande from the aulter, you sacrileginge (I should have said you sacrificinge) priestes<sup>1</sup>;" and in another instance, which I shall have occasion to notice presently. It was, indeed, a common piece of humour among writers and speakers of that period. Thus Bale, in his "Brief Chronicle of Lord Cobham," says; "He abhorred all the superstitious sorceries, ceremonies I should say, of the proud Romish church<sup>2</sup>." The writer of "A Lamentacyon of a Christian," printed in 1548, speaks of "the unholy (I shoulde say holy) mayde of Kent<sup>3</sup>;" and in a "Dialogue" printed a few years after, the author, describing some of the Romish services, says; "And the devil (the deacon I should have said,) read the middle text<sup>4</sup>."

Now this species of wit occurs not unfrequently in Fox's work. For instance, at Vol. V. p. 635, he says; "two false fiends, I should say, friars:" and the Editor suffers it to pass without notice, while, in every other place where I have observed it, he has not seen the intended wit, and has so altered the text as to get rid of it, and make nonsense. Thus, after speaking of the synod held at London, in 1413,

<sup>1</sup> Stry. Mem. Vol. III. P. ii. p. 293.

<sup>2</sup> Sig. A viii.

<sup>3</sup> Sig. A v. b. (xxx. 8. 14. 8vo.)

<sup>4</sup> Sig. D iii. b. (xxx. 8. 20. 8vo.)

Fox says ; “ In that synod . . . was determined that the day of St. George and also of St. Dunstan, should be double feast, called *duplex festum* in holy Kitching, in holy Church, I would say<sup>1</sup>.” Of course there is, or is meant to be, something very humourous in an author’s so tripping and catching himself up, and hoping no offence, and looking very sly and laughing in his sleeve, just as we may imagine Dr. Kettle, the Master of Trinity College, Oxford, when he “ would presently recal himself,” after having, with pretended inadvertence, commemorated “ Sir Thomas Pope, our *con*-Founder<sup>2</sup>.” But the Editor suspected nothing of this, and destroyed it all by altering the text to “ should be a double feast, called Duplex Festum in holy church : in holy kitchen, I would say<sup>3</sup>.” Again : Fox relating the disputations of Cranmer at Oxford, says in his text, “ That done, they came all into the Quier, and there held the Convocation of the Universitie. They had Masse of the Holy Ghost solemnly sung in pricksong by the Quier men of Christes Church.” This matter Fox thought fit to commend to the attention of his readers by a facetious side note, in these terms ; “ Masse in pike-sauce, in pricke-song I would say<sup>4</sup>.” The Editor, not seeing the wit of this, has transposed it, and put it as a note at the bottom of the page,

<sup>1</sup> Edit. 1583, vol. i. p. 553.

<sup>2</sup> Letters of Eminent Persons, &c. in the Bodleian, Vol. III. p. 425.

<sup>3</sup> New Edit. iii. p. 319.

<sup>4</sup> Ed. 1596, p. 1229.



where it looks silly enough, “‘Mass in prick-song’—mass in pike-sauce, I would say<sup>1</sup>.” Again: Latimer in his letter to King Henry, says of those whom he calls Pharisees<sup>2</sup>, “they have sore blinded your liege people and subjects with their lawes, customs, ceremonies, and Banbury glosses, and punished them with cursings, excommunications, and other corruptions, (corrections I would say,) &c.<sup>3</sup>” The Editor, who does not seem to have suspected even father Latimer of pleasantry, puts a very sober note for the use of his readers. It is neither more nor less than this, “‘I would say,’ *i. e.* I wish to say.—ED.” The same wit is used by Careless in one of his letters, where he says; “bloodthirsty bitesheeps (bishops I should say)<sup>4</sup>.” In a letter to Bonner, too, as it stands in the new edition, at Vol. VII. p. 713, we find “your lordship is made the common slaughter-slave to all your fellows—bite-sheep bishops, I would say.” In the edition of 1596 it stands less incorrectly, “to all

<sup>1</sup> New Ed. vol. vi. p. 441.

<sup>2</sup> Lest people should not understand who were meant, Fox put a side-note to this; “The subtle wiliness and practice of the *Prelates*.” In the new edition that word is changed to *Pharisees*. By what right or for what reason? This I happen accidentally to see on turning to the page, to look for the matter of which I have spoken in the text; and I also observe, that instead of “sore blinded” the new edition has “so blinded.” It may be only carelessness; but one must never expect to look out a mistake without hitting upon one or two others.

<sup>3</sup> Ed. 1596, p. 1590.

<sup>4</sup> Vol. vii. p. 506.

<sup>5</sup> Vol. viii. p. 172. (Ed. 1596, p. 1743.)



your fellowes, bitesheep bishops I would say," p. 1673. In a copy of the letter given by Strype, it is, as no doubt it ought to be, "fellow bitesheeps (bishops I would say) <sup>1</sup>."

At Vol. VI. p. 556, there is a copy of Latin verses, entitled, "Answer by the Bishop of Norwich to the Bishop of Lincoln," which originated thus:—"Master White, then Bishop of Lincoln, (his political vein being drunk with joy of the marriage,) spewed out certain verses" about the marriage of Philip and Mary, in which he showed that it had been very distasteful to certain parties whom he mentions, namely, the devil, the Scotch, the heretics, (the *humani generis dæmon vetus hostis*, the *Scotus inops*, the *hæreticus*, &c.); and among others, to the Catiline of the age, Sir Thomas Wyatt, (*ætatis nostræ Catilina*, *Viatus*.) The 'Answer by the Bishop of Norwich,' or rather the two answers made to these lines of Bishop White, are conceived in a style of parody, abusing the Papists in no measured terms, talking of the 'Italus Goliath,' and his "papicolæ," the "grex pontificum, stirps Caiphæ, turba bicornis," warmly defending Sir Thomas Wyat, and calling him '*fortissimus ille Viatus*,' and '*bonus ille Viatus*.' Now, who does the reader suppose was this Bishop of Norwich, who was thus magnifying the rebel, abusing the Papists, and making it out, that the Queen's marriage was pleasing to them, and their

<sup>1</sup> Strype's Mem. Vol. iii. P. ii. p. 386.

father the devil, but hateful in the eyes of all decent people? Why, if we may believe the Editor's note, no less a person than "Dr. John Hopton," who had been the chaplain of the Lady Mary, and whom she had (6th Oct. 1554,) made Bishop of Norwich. Of course it would be silly, after what has been already produced, to speak as if it could have been expected that the Editor should have known anything about the general history of the times, or the particular histories, qualities, and opinions of Bishop Hopton, and his antipodean successor Bishop Parkhurst, except as he might have happened to pick up something of names, while the sheets of the book which he had undertaken to edit passed under his eye; but how could he avoid doing something of this sort? Had not he just been printing in this same volume, "A Remembrance of certain matters appointed by the Council, to be declared by *Dr. Hopton*, to the Lady Mary's Grace, for answer to her former letter; which said Hopton was, after she came to her reign, Bishop of Norwich," VI. 8. Perhaps, however, it was just from having recorded this that he knew the name of Hopton as a bishop of Norwich at all, while he knew so little of the book which he and his experienced assistants were editing, as not to be aware, that in the next volume he would have to exhibit "the said bishop, Dr. Hopton," and his chancellor, acting "full like unmerciful prelates," VII. 372, and in the volume after, to record "Three examinations of John Fortune, before Dr. Hopton, Bishop of

Norwich," VIII. 161. "The troubles of Peter Moon and his wife and of other godly Protestants, at Bishop Hopton's visitation in Ipswich," *ibid*, 223; and "The Story and Martyrdom of William Seaman, Thomas Carman, and Thomas Hudson, put to death by the persecuting Papists at Norwich," under "the bishop's bloody blessing of condemnation," *ibid*, 463.

Vol. VI. p. 592, there is an elaborate note occasioned by the statement, that John Rogers "went to Wittenberg, in Saxony, where he, with much soberness of living, did not only greatly increase in all good and godly learning, but also so much profited in the knowledge of the Dutch tongue, that the charge of a congregation was orderly committed to his cure." On this the Editor says, "We can hardly suppose that Rogers preached Dutch to the poor Saxons, of which language they understood nothing. This error has occurred before, and has been briefly noticed; but it may be as well to endeavour to account for its origin. The adjective which means 'German,' is in the German tongue, 'Deutsch,' and this has been translated 'Dutch,' instead of 'German;' for it is not probable that there should have been a congregation of Hollanders in an inland town like Wittenberg. The German word for a native of Holland is 'Holländer,' and the adjective expressing our word 'Dutch' is 'Holländisch.' *It would seem* that, in early times, German and Dutch were called respectively 'High Dutch' and 'Low Dutch;' but the word 'Dutch,' without

an accompanying adjective, has always meant in our tongue ‘a Hollander,’ or that which belongs to Holland. A reference to the Latin edition of the Acts and Monuments, (Basle, 1559, p. 266,) confirms the above observations, ‘Profectus ilicò Vuittenbergam adeo in Germanicâ discendâ linguâ celeres fecit progressus,’ etc. The town of Wittenberg, it may be added, can scarcely *now*, with propriety, be said to be in Saxony, as it is in the dominions of Prussia; although our best English gazetteer, published in 1822, calls it Wittemberg, and says that it belongs to the electorate of Saxony, which electorate in 1822 had long ceased to exist, and Wittenberg belonged to Prussia. The Prussians still call the province in which Wittenberg is situated, the ‘Provinz Sachse,’ because it did formerly make a part of the electorate of Saxony.—ED.” It seems as if it might be highly expedient to cancel this note; though it may not be easy fully to explain to the Editor all the reasons for doing so.

Vol. VII. p. 7. Among the matters objected against the Bishop of St. David’s, one was, that “To the ploughing of a pasture not above ten days’ work, in Lent, anno 1549, he had thirty-two ploughs in one day; and these ploughs the priest bade in the Church, contrary to the statute of *Gomortha* in that behalf provided, and to the evil example of the gentlemen of that country.” It being probable that very few of the subscribers will know what this means, it may be worth while to put



a note to this effect, "If you do not know what this means, you had better try to find out." Such a note will be much the same in effect, and less curt in expression than the present note, which is neither more nor less than "'Gomortha,' or Comorth, see old statutes.—ED."

Vol. VII. p. 131. Bonaventure being mentioned in the text, the note tells us, "Bonaventure, who was the compiler of our Lady's Psalter, lived A.D. 1470, and was canonized A.D. 1482." How the former of these dates stands in the edition of 1583 I have not at present the means of ascertaining; but in those of 1576 and 1597 it is 1170. Both dates are bad enough, for Bonaventure was born A.D. 1221.

Vol. VII. p. 274. "I might have written . . . . but yet I have not," says Bradford, "now the cause I *would* not. And why *would* I not, but because I *could* not? I mean, because my *canning* is taken away by sin," &c. The Editor appends a note to tell us that "canning" means "wisdom."

On the same page Bradford says, "God's deserts have otherwise bound me," and the Editor puts a note to tell us that the word "deserts" means "mercies."

Vol. VII. p. 27<sup>5</sup>. There is a note to tell us that the word "belly-cheer" means "selfishness," though (even if the word had not in itself a pretty plain-spoken meaning) the burthen of the letter in which it occurs, is the regret that Bradford felt about a supper which had been made in his chamber. Perhaps it might be as well to cancel it.



Vol. VII. p. 613. Philpot having annexed to his account of his third examination, "Thus for the third fit," the Editor gives a note "'Fitte' or fight.—ED." He can of course cancel it or not as he likes.

Vol. VII. p. 665. In reply to Philpot's assertion that he had the Spirit of God, Morgan accused him of being actuated by the "spirit of the buttery," and charged his companions with having gone drunk to the stake. The phrase is, one would think, pretty intelligible; but as the Editor did not understand it himself, he may, if he pleases, explain it to his readers by an extract from a book printed in the same year in which Fox began his publication of *Martyrology* at Strasburg. It will show that the Puritans could retort the charge;—"Many times this hath been seen, that the clerk hath left the cross behind him, and the priest his gospel-book, and scant found the right way home, they have been so cumbered with malt-wormes and miseled with the spirit of the buttery<sup>1</sup>." In this case, however, it will be necessary to cancel the present note, which says, that Morgan

<sup>1</sup> Sig. D viii. b. (xxx. 8. 20. 8vo.) The full title is "A Dialogue, or familiar talke betwene two neighbours concerning the chyefest ceremonyes that were by the mighti power of God's most holie pure worde suppressed in Englande, and now for our unworthines set vp agayne by the Bishoppes, the imps of Antichrist: right learned, profitable, and pleasaunt to be read, for the comfort of weak consciences in these troublous daies. Read first and then judge. From Roane, by Michael Wodde, the xx of February, Anno Domi. M.D.L.III."

referred to "A fairy or goblin said to haunt pantries or buttries."

Vol. VIII. p. 59. We read that Bishop Brooks said to Cranmer, "there is such *cauteria* of heresy crept into your conscience," &c. The Editor appends this note, "'Cauteria,' i. e. fires.—ED." It is a pity the Editor did not think of 1 Tim. iv. 2.

Vol. VIII. p. 222. We are told that Dr. Argentine would not preach without his "white *minever* hood." The note is "'Minever,' a skin with specks of white." If this is correct, it may be worth while to add a few words, explaining how white specks look on a white skin.

Vol. VIII, p. 326. "What heart," says Fox, "will not lament the murdering mischiefs of these men, who, for want of work, do so wreak their *tine* on poor silly women." The Editor's note is, "'Wreak their tine,' that is, 'wreak their malice or cruelty,' a 'tine' being the point or prong of a fork.—ED." A *tine* *being* the prong of a fork, one sees the matter at once. It is not as if a *tine* had been the handle of a fork, or the blade of a knife. Being the point *or* the prong, it of course means malice *or* cruelty. Why did the Editor suspend his railroad printing, and infinite collations, to write such stuff as this? Such phrases as "Cold winter storms and *wreakful teene*," or "nought could mollify his raging *teene*," with which Nares's Glossary might have furnished him, would do more to untie, or cut the knot, than all the knives and forks in the world.

Vol. VIII. p. 353, we are told that Dr. Langdale, parson of Buxsted, in his examination of Thomas Woodman, said, "Your father is an honest man, and one of my parish, and hath wept to me divers times, because you would not be ruled; and he loveth you well, and so doth all the country, both rich and poor, if it were not for those evil opinions that you hold, with many such like tales of Robin Hood." The Editor is justly scandalized at what he considers a demonstration of historical scepticism, and thus reproves the parson of Buxsted; "Dr. Langdale seems to doubt the existence of this forester, or, at least, he esteemed the tenets of the Protestants as lightly as he did some of the tales connected with him;" [which is almost the very same thing] "but Bailey, in his 'Etymological Dictionary' informs us, 'This Robin Hood was a famous robber, and storied to be an expert archer in the time of King Richard the first, about the year 1200; his principal haunt was about Sherwood Forest, in Nottinghamshire.'—Ed." It is too true, and the truth is too often sadly exemplified in party writings, that one man may steal a horse while another must not look over the hedge. Or, may we charitably believe that when the Editor began his labours, he had not formed an acquaintance with the Philologic Nathan, and so passed over unawares, in the very first sheet which he edited, the more palpable scepticism of Fox himself; "as concerning the miracles which are read in the church of Winchester, of this Swithin, them I leave to be read

together with the Iliads of Homer, or the tales of Robin Hood.”—II. 9. Worse than Jacob Bryant.

Vol. VIII. p. 498. We are told that “a certain poor woman, and a silly creature,” left her husband and children, and sought “her living by labour of *spinning* here and there for a time.” She returned, however, but was afterwards accused of heresy and brought before the Bishop of Exeter and his chancellor. “ ‘Thou foolish woman,’ quoth the Bishop, ‘I hear say that thou hast spoken certain words against the most blessed sacrament of the altar, the body of Christ. Fie for shame! thou art an unlearned person and a woman. Wilt thou meddle with such high matters, which all the doctors of the world cannot define? Wilt thou talk of so high mysteries? Keep thy work and meddle with that thou hast to do. It is no woman’s matter at *cards and tow* to be spoken of,” &c. A pretty long conversation ensued; after which the chancellor and others “persuaded the bishop that she was a mazed creature . . . . . and therefore they consulted together, that she should have liberty, and go at large. So the keeper of the bishop’s prison had her home to his house, where she fell to *spinning* and *carding*,” &c. Now, does it seem possible that any body should read all this about the poor woman’s usual occupations, and yet imagine, that when the bishop spoke to this “silly creature” about “cards and tow,” he meant playing at cards and spinning a tee-totum? Yet, that such was the belief of the Editor is attested by his note. “ ‘Tow’



probably a ‘totum;’ a kind of die which is whirleed round.—ED.”

It may be said that few of the readers of Fox are likely to be so deplorably ignorant as to be misled by these absurd notes. They may show the ignorance and unfitness of the Editor, and the insolent obstinacy of the publishers who kept him through the whole work; though they can scarcely be supposed to be persons so entirely illiterate and friendless, as not to have learned in some way or another that it was impossible, under his management, to fulfil their promise to their subscribers. All this (it may be said) is shown by the notes; but they are too gross, too obviously absurd, to do much mischief.

In this I fully concur, and I beg the reader to bear in mind, that they are not brought forward as things likely to do harm. On the contrary, I expect them to do a great deal of good in many different ways. One benefit (which it is most to our present purpose to notice) is, that they tell us at once what it is important that we should know, but might have been some time finding out. They give us, I mean, a pretty clear insight into the character and capability of the Editor, and much more than atone for the evil (if any) which is likely to ensue from their leading those into error who are so ignorant as to be misled by them. Fox’s Martyrology, viewed as a history or a document, is no more injured by these silly notes than a lease and release of an estate would be by a

child's endorsing one as Chevy Chase, and the other as the story of Cock Robin; or by the lawyer's clerk giving his private opinion in the margin, that the words "heirs and assigns" meant "hares and rabbits." The owner of the property might be sorry that his deeds had been disfigured by impertinent scribbling, but nobody would dream that his title was affected. The real evil which makes this edition of Fox waste paper is, not that the Editor has given these notes into the bargain along with the text, but that the person who wrote these *notes* has been permitted to go over the *text*, and has exercised *a discretionary power of altering it where and how he pleased*. That he has done so is certain; to what extent can be learned only by actual collation; and the consequence is, that without such collation nobody can tell whether any one sentence which he reads in the new edition is as Fox wrote it, or whether it has been meddled with, modernized, and perhaps unintentionally perverted by the Editor. Absurd as his note upon "tow" is, we must be thankful that he gave it us, instead of tacitly correcting the text to "tee-totum;" for he has elsewhere taken quite as great liberties, founded on as great ignorance, though of course we know not how often.

One must, however, do the Editor the justice to say, that he sometimes pursues a medium course, which has two forms. I will give a specimen of each before I proceed to the subject of tacit alteration.

Vol. VIII. p. 384. We find Thomas Tye reporting to Bishop Bonner, by whom he was employed, that on a certain day “the *aches* took him.” This is the Editor’s emendation of the text, but he puts a note to tell us that it is “spelt ‘axis’ in the original.” This was in his view (as his pleasant publishers endeavoured to persuade their subscribers that some other things were) a “supposed mis-spelling<sup>1</sup> ;” and thus he sets matters right, letting us know withal how much we were indebted to him. So we can only be sorry that he exposed his ignorance, and wish that he had let the text alone, and put a note to say, that “axis” or “accesse,” in Thomas Tye’s day, meant a fit of the ague.

A second form of what may be called a medium course, is to put the proposed emendation in brackets.

Vol. VIII. p. 165. John Careless says, “By these articles, which you have of mine, it doth plainly appear, that though the Arians, Anabaptists, or any other kind of heretic, as you confess those to be, do write against the truth which I hold, doth it therefore follow, that I am a heretic as they be? No, I trow not; but it is rather a plain demonstration that I

<sup>1</sup> The Editor’s ideas about spelling seem indeed to be very much like those of his publishers, who would have had it believed that Turin was a mis-spelling of Tours, and Augsburg of Aosta, &c., for in vol. vii. p. 212, he puts a note on the name of one *Glasier* to tell us, that elsewhere it is “spelt *Blaser*,” which is very much as if one were to find the name of *Jones* spelt *Evans*.

am a true Christian in that these heretics do so contend against." This the Editor did not understand. He did not see the force of Careless's statement, that his orthodoxy was demonstrated "in *that* [whatsoever it might be, in *that* particular point at least which] those heretics do so contend against." The Editor not understanding this, has added a word which totally alters, or destroys, the sense, and it now stands, "in that these heretics do so contend against [me]<sup>1</sup>."

These, as I have said, are two forms of a medium course, not much more mischievous than the notes, because the Editor furnishes us with the means of correcting his errors. But who is to answer for the corrections *tacitly* made? Made, it is granted, with good intention, but made by mere random guesses of one so ignorant. I have given abundant proof of this in my Letters; but it cannot be too often repeated, that the specimens produced are only such as happen to have been noticed in very cursory inspection, or an accidental collation, when the eye has been caught by some strange word, or unintelligible phrase. Nobody can tell (perhaps least of all the Editor himself) how much the text of the new edition has been changed by intended cor-

<sup>1</sup> I have formerly noticed the Editor's misunderstanding of a similar phrase with similar ill-effect: "According to *that* God hath elected," (which is given as the translation of "*secundum quod Deus elegit*,") he has altered into "according to that God *who* hath elected." Vol. ii. p. 297. See Letters on Fox, p. 24.



rections, or capricious and childish alterations. He, or some one of the more lucky persons unknown, whom he terms his "amanuenses," and who, if we may believe him, have made all the blunders, has apparently crawled over every page, carefully changing *that* into *which*, and *which* into *who*, where modern taste requires it; making all sorts of petty and frivolous alterations, and if the ignorant meddler did not know what a word meant, he substituted the best that he could think of in its place. Often there is nothing to indicate that any alteration has been made in the text; as, for instance, when we read in Vol. VIII. p. 572, (I prefer quoting the more recent volumes, because I have already given so many instances from the more early, and because the publishers boast of the progressive purity of the work,) that Mr. Bertie defended himself "with his dagger and rapier," the thing seems very natural, and excites no suspicion, though if we look at the old text we find that he had a "dagge," that is, a pistol, not a "dagger." But when we read in the same page that his wife (the Duchess of Suffolk) and her woman "were apparelled like the women of the Netherlands with *hooks*," we may feel curious to look at the old texts, and there we shall find "*huiks*," which, as Nares would have told the unlucky emender of the text, is "a kind of mantle or cloak worn in Spain and the Low Countries." Again, when at page 561 of the same eighth volume we find that a poor woman "was set and carried the space well

nigh of a mile, by strangers," we may well be puzzled until we turn to the old text, and find that she was "fet;" but the emender appears not to have known that form of "fetched." This almost incredible ignorance of the words and phraseology of his own country, rendered the Editor most unfit for the work which he undertook, and it is impossible to say how many instances actual collation would supply. When he found that "the sayde Oneley (otherwise named Bolingbroke) tooke it uppon hys death that they neuer intended any such thing as they were condemned for" (Ed. 1583, p. 703), he seems not to have known what that phrase meant, and so changed the word *it* into *oath*, and it now stands that he "took *oath* upon his death," &c. (Vol. III. p. 707.) Again, there is a story of a poor woman who got her husband into great trouble by longing for sucking-pig in Lent, and who feeling that she was the cause of all the mischief, wished to bear the penance instead of her husband, saying "it was long of her and not of him" (Ed. 1596, p. 1081); but the Editor not understanding his own language, and looking back to the origin of the business, makes us read, "it was *the* long of her and not of him."—Vol. V. p. 386.

Vol. V. p. 395, we have a story of a "ruffian" who "used to go with his hair hanging about his ears, down unto his shoulders, after a strange monstrous manner (counterfeiting belike the wild Irishmen, or else *Crimisus the Trojan*, whom Virgil speaketh of), as one weary of his own English fashion." I did not

recollect such a person in Virgil, and turned to the edition of 1596, where instead of “Crimisus the Trojan,” I found *Crinitus Ioppas*. The allusion to the *Æn.* I. 744, is plain enough ; but why, in the face of Servius and the Punic History, the editor should make this monarch a Trojan, and so transport “Ilium in Africam,” is inconceivable ; and certainly not one of the things “docuit quæ maximus Atlas,” supposing the Editor to use one.

Vol. VI. p. 29. “We *cannot but see* that images may be counted marvellous books.” At p. 1220, Ed. 1596, it is “We *cannot see but* images,” &c.

*Ibid.* “Would have only your letters of Greek and Latin in estimation, and *blind* all them which understand not these languages from the knowledge of God’s word.” The old edition reads “*bind*.”

Vol. VI. p. 30. “The magistrate’s duty is . . . to *see* and provide,” stands (Ed. 1596. 1221.) “to *sit* and provide.”

Vol. VIII. p. 206. Perhaps “joys” for “toys” (Ed. 1596, p. 1757) in the margin may be a misprint, though the matter in the text makes it possible that it may have been meant for a correction.

Vol. VIII. p. 402. It may also be mere carelessness that has turned “the sacraments and sacramentals of holy Church” (p. 1826, Ed. 1596) into “the sacraments and sacramentals of the Holy Ghost.”

Vol. VIII. p. 593, is however clearly meant for a

correction. When Dr. Sands was brought prisoner to London, as he came through Tower Hill Street, a woman standing in her door, cried, "Fie on thee, thou knave! thou knave, thou traitor, thou heretic!" whereat he smiled; 'Look, the desperate heretic,' said she, 'laughed at this *jeer*.' The edition of 1596, p. 1892, reads "geare," but the editor put out the word which he did not know, and put in one which he did. I hope that he first consulted his friend Bailey, though certainly if he did, "stuff, attire, women's apparel; also harness for draught horses or oxen," was not very promising. If he had turned to Nares, however, he would have found the first meaning, which he gives to be "GEAR or GEER, matter, subject, or business in general."

Vol. VIII. p. 607, that which in the edition of 1596, p. 1896, stands "the *carefull* fear and captivity of their innocent lady," is changed into "*carnal* fear."

Now those who read only the specimens contained in the foregoing pages, and believe (as those who know my engagements while the more recent volumes have been in publication will believe) that they are not the fruit of regular collation, but what have presented themselves when at odd times I have taken up a volume, and dipped into it at random,—those, I say, who believe this, and, still more, those who disbelieve it, if their disbelief should lead them to seek for themselves, will feel that the unhappy publishers, whether deceivers or deceived, are objects



of pity to every Christian, when they read the following paragraph in the notice prefixed to the volume just published :—

“ Between their resolving on the publication, and the actual commencement of the printing, very few weeks elapsed. The only thing then aimed at, was, to give Foxe’s History, *as correctly as possible, in the state in which he left it.*

“ On the appearance, however, of Volumes II. and III., *printed on this system*<sup>1</sup>, an attack was made upon them, grounded on the assumption, that no new edition of Foxe ought to have been produced without a full correction of all his errors. Without admitting the entire justice of this assumption, the Editor and the Proprietors so far endeavoured to meet this new demand as to bring the later volumes under a different system of revision from that which had been adopted in the earlier. In the last *four or five* volumes, they believe they may assume, that not only has Foxe been *printed faithfully*, but most of *his errors corrected* by reference to original sources.”

There is, however, another point on which I wish to offer a few remarks, because a good deal of stress is laid upon it in this new edition; and, whatever suspicion I might entertain, I have not before had it in my power to speak on this subject. Much has

---

<sup>1</sup> I trust that I have sufficiently exposed the falsehood of this statement; and the pretence that the matters complained of were only such “errors” of Fox as they did not think it worth while to correct, is too barefaced. But I quote the passage here chiefly with reference to the notion that in these more recent volumes, not only the Editor has nothing to apologize for or to cancel, but that Fox’s errors have been completely corrected.

been said about making this a *complete* edition of Fox's Martyrology, by replacing, from the first English edition, what had been dropped in subsequent reprints. As to this matter generally, it was obvious that however curious it might be in an antiquarian or bibliographical point of view, it was likely to be attended with some injury, not to say injustice, to the author. Suppose that at a future time some admirers of Fox should republish "the Standard Edition" of Fox, with a pledge that the hundreds of leaves which have been cancelled shall be restored to their original absurdity, would not that be dealing hard measure to Mr. Cattley and Mr. Townsend?

But whether these things which Fox from time to time omitted, should be replaced or not, nobody will doubt that, if it is done, it should be done correctly. Yet having lately been favoured, by the kindness of Mr. Pickering of Chancery Lane, with a sight of the first English edition of Fox (I am sorry to say at a time when I was so engaged as to be unable to make use of it as much as I could have wished), I have compared some parts, and cannot but express my belief that the matter thus introduced has been very carelessly brought in, and in some places altered very absurdly.

Vol. II. p. 200, there is a copy of the "old laws," in which the Editor seems to have made one or two very unhappy conjectural emendations. One pities the childish taste which, in professing to reprint an old document like this, could make petty variations

such as, for “if any controversy arise,” putting “if any controversy *shall* arise”—for “No Archbishop *or* Bishop *or* person,” putting “No Archbishop *nor* Bishop *nor* person;” and such petty impertinences as transposing words to make them read more pleasantly. But the conjectural emendations are of more importance. The second paragraph begins, “Churches such as be *de feudo* Regis.” The words are, improperly, printed without a space between them; and (as I have noticed in my letters) the Editor has made it “defendo Regis.” How he would have translated this, I do not know; but the alteration in the fifth paragraph is more important. It stands in the first edition, “Such goods or catall as be forfayted to the king, neyther any *sentuary* of church, or church yard to detayne them.” It would seem as if the editor had never heard of a right of *sanctuary*; but had seen men in red coats with fixed bayonets, who might be mounting guard over goods or catall pro “defendo regis,” and he has altered the word to “sentry.” What is the value of documents that have been tampered with by such ignorance?

Vol. VII. p. 124. There is a “Te Deum lauding God specially with prayer therein for our Queen Mary,” which forms part of a passage reprinted from the first English edition, p. 1139. In the third verse “*the* heavens” is changed into “*all* heavens.” In the next verse the alteration of “Cherubyn and Seraphyn” was I suppose made by conferring it with the Ebrew, and under an impression that the purity

of the original tongue was of more consequence than the rhyme :

“ First Cherubim and Seraphim  
With ardent love entier,  
Sing day and night and doth not lin.”

Two verses forward the presence of the article was perhaps thought more important than the metre, and was therefore inserted :

“ Thou art *the* Lord God of Sabaoth,  
Of hosts that is to say.”

But one can hardly suppose the various readings in the 9th and 10th verses to be meant for corrections ; the original is as follows :

“ The number passing laudable  
Of prophets all and *some*  
Set forth thy praise honourable  
And sovereign wisdom.  
The goodly fellowship so sweet  
Of martyrs flourishing,  
Lowly kneeling before thy feet  
Thy praise doth always *sing*.”

In the new edition, for the three words here printed in *italics*, are substituted the words *sum*, *let*, and *ring*. In the 20th verse “ God *thy* Father ” is changed into “ God *the* Father.” And in the second line of the 27th verse we find the word “ enure ” altered to “ endure,” which is thus put to rhyme to itself.

Vol. V. p. 407, there is a poem of which I have already spoken, and of which I cannot speak again,



without again expressing my surprise that so profane a piece of ribaldry should have been issued by men professing a respect for the Christian religion; but that is their business. In it an image of our crucified Redeemer is thus described according to the new edition :

“ He was made to jogle ;  
 His eyes would gogle.  
     He wold bend his brows, and frown ;  
 With his head he would nod  
 Like a proper young god ;  
     His shaftes would go up and down.”

On this the Editor puts a note, “ ‘ Shaftes,’ the wooden limbs of the figure.—ED.” How could he imagine it possible that any one could make a figure representing a human body nailed to the cross, while at the same time the limbs “ would go up and down?” Did he think that he understood it himself? Would it not have been better, was it not his duty, to let alone what he did not understand, instead of boldly changing “ chaftes” into “ shaftes,” and then making these shafts into limbs, because he did not know that “ chaftes” is the same as “ chaps?”

On the next page, he has obscured a line by a petty alteration, which shows that he did not understand it himself. When those who have just read his note on the “ wooden limbs of the figure,” come to read, in the same poem,—

“ For when they bored holes  
 In the roodes back of poles,”—

they will be more apt to think that the "wooden limbs of the figure" were made of wooden poles, than that the rood belonged to Poles or St. Paul's. I hope Mr. Townsend will excuse my descending to such minute criticism, as to mention the changing a capital letter into a small one; for it is a sad thing to see old documents that are quite obscure enough, made more so by the tampering of ignorance; and this may be done by very petty changes. If people think that it does not matter whether we understand what we read, or whether what we read are really words having meaning, let them say so; but let them not quarrel with those who think otherwise. Will anybody tell me what is the meaning of this passage, which occurs in a letter of Latimer, reprinted from the first edition: speaking of the Bishop of London, he says, "If I would do as some men say my Lord doth, gather up my *joyce*, as we call it, warily and narrowly, and yet neither preach for it in mine own cure, nor yet otherwise, peradventure he would nothing deny me." Vol. VII. p. 485. I confess that I do not know what Latimer meant by gathering up his "*joyce*," if that is the right reading. On turning to the first edition, I found that there the fourth letter was not a *c*, but an *s*, and whatever the first might be, it certainly was not a *j*. It might, however, be an *i*, for in the copy which I had the opportunity to consult, the letter is so indistinct, that I would not take upon me to decide; but I suspect it is a *t*, and so I came to the word *toyse*.

Of this, however, I could make nothing; but mentioning it to my friend Mr. Haweis, who is, I suppose, one of the most likely persons in the world to know what Latimer and his friends did say, or were likely to say, he suggested that it was probably the provincial pronunciation, (Latimer says, "as we call it,") which was to be thus reduced *toyse, toythes, tythes*. This, of course, was on the supposition that I was correct in taking the first letter for a *t*; if any one who has access to a copy of the first edition, will inform me how it stands there I shall feel much obliged.

I need hardly say, that most, if not all of the passages noticed in these pages, had been observed before the first volume of Fox appeared; and when I had no idea that a supplementary volume would afford so good an opportunity of supplying the subscribers with the means of correcting their books. To these corrections I hope further to contribute, but I have many things on my hands, and Mr. Townsend's performance claims some notice. In the meanwhile I add one observation. The publishers tell us, that they have brought out "the later volumes under a different system of revision from that which had been adopted in the former; but I think, that those who look at some of the things specified in these pages, will not doubt that a very mischievous power was permitted to remain in the same hands throughout. But what the publishers mean is, I believe, that they were obliged to get

Mr. Cattley some better informed assistants, who from time to time furnished him with notes which he could not have written; and he repaid them by printing their (to him) unintelligible learning in such a way as must needs make them ashamed of their performances, and perfectly satisfied with the “*vos non vobis*” system, under which everything good and bad was claimed by the “ED.” Certainly even this assistance has too often given him additional opportunities of displaying his ignorance in other cases beside that of Trithemius.

Take for instance a note which occurs at Vol. VI. p. 409, and which, considering that it is merely appended to a statement, that Philpot vouched the major of his argument “out of Vigilius, an ancient writer,” contains more learning on the subject than most Editors would have thought necessary. It is as follows:—

“Vigilius was bishop of Thapsus, and flourished about the year 500, or earlier; his treatise against Eutyches is included in the *Bibliothecæ Patrum*, as in the first Paris collection, vol. v. pp. 567—584, where it is incorrectly assigned to Vigilius, bishop of Trent. His works have been published in a collected form by Chifflet; Divione, 1665. He also published separately, the treatise here referred to. Tiguri, 1539; also Basileæ, 1571. See Oudin. *Comment. de Scrip. Eccles.* tom. i. col. 1320; also Walchii *Biblioth.*—Pat. p. 611. Jenæ, 1834; and Rivet’s *Critici Sacri*, lib. iv. cap. 28.—ED.”

Father Chifflet certainly lived to a great age; but did he really republish, at Dijon, in 1665, a work which he had published at Zurich, one hundred and



twenty years before? But it is rather of the general look of the note as it stands in the book, that I now speak. Will anybody, for instance, who sees the reference to Walch's book, believe that the person who superintended the printing had ever seen it, or knew what the reference meant?

Take again, a note which stands thus at Vol. VI. p. 372.

“Legimus et circa annos christianæ salutis 500, fere, jam institutas Epistolas in officio Missali, etc.—Pet. Ciruelus Darocensis in Expositio libri Missalis (complete 1528) in epist. nuncup. [Peter Ciruelo was a native of Daroca, in Arragon, and became canon of Salamanca, and then professor of theology, at Alcala de Henares. See also Antonio, Biblioth. Hispana nova, tom. ii. p. 185. Matriti, 1788.—Ed.]”

It will be observed that this note is partly Fox's and partly editorial. We are at present concerned with the latter, which is twofold, and consists of first an insertion or interpolation in a parenthesis, and secondly, an addition between brackets. Both, I presume, were furnished to the Editor by some better informed assistant, who unfortunately neglected to inform him of the connexion between them, by telling him that the Latin name for *Alcala de Henares* was *Complutum*. How then was the editor to guess that the parenthesis contained the name of the place where Peter was professor, and where his book was printed? Who ever heard of such a word as *Compluti* in any language or any polyglot? Could he suppose it was anything but *complete*, and meant to indicate

that the book was published all at once in 1528, and not in numbers, as he had proposed to publish "Fox's Martyrs<sup>1</sup>." No: many are the marks of ignorance which these better informed assistants have elicited from the Editor. I do not mean to blame them; but at the same time, who can believe that, if they had not set him on, the Editor would have talked of any one of the persons whom he calls Audin, Sledian, Sleiden, Hardwine, Labbé, Beatus Rheananus, Genebard, Possuevinus, Montfauçon, Balurius, Opirinus, Chocleus or Cholceus, Gearsonus, or Waldanus. I shall perhaps be told that these are "supposed misspellings;" but every man who has paid any attention to the matter, is aware that one of the surest criteria by which to judge of a writer's information, is to be found in his references.

<sup>1</sup> It is curious, and characteristic of the work, that neither the Editor nor his informant seem to have observed a fact, of which it was much more incumbent on them to have informed the reader, than it was to provide him with biographical or bibliographical information respecting Petrus Ciruelus, namely, that the scrap of Latin given in the note is grossly misrepresented in the text;—"Legimus et circa annos Christianæ salutis 500, fere, jam institutas epistolas in officio missali."—"We read that about 500 years since almost the epistle,' saith he, 'was brought into the Mass.'" Whether the Epistle formed a part of the Mass about the 500th year of the Christian era, or 500 years before Peter's complete work was published in 1528, may make some difference in the argument.

## N O T E S.

---

### NOTE A, on Page 9.

As I have already said, the question whether Fox copied from Illyricus, and indeed the whole question of his use of authorities, belongs to Mr. Townsend rather than to Mr. Cattley; but as the latter gentleman has chosen to enter on it, and, in fact, it is the only thing in his "Defence" which seems to require any answer from me, I have thought it best to reply to it in these Remarks, and to say something respecting Mr. Townsend's notice of the subject in a note. It is rather a curious circumstance, that just after I had written what is in the text, a friend came into my room, took up the volume, and while I was engaged about something else, read the following passage, with its note, from p. 234.

"With respect, however, to the accusation that Foxe borrowed his account of the Waldenses from Illyricus, an examination of the facts of the case would rather make us believe that Illyricus and Foxe both borrowed from some common document. With respect also to the supposition—that Illyricus, rather than Foxe, is entitled to the appellation of founder of that school of church history, which made the holy Catholic Church, not necessarily identified with the church of Rome—there appears to be sufficient evidence to render it very probable, that *Illyricus was indebted to Foxe, rather than Foxe to Illyricus.*

"In the year 1554, Foxe, as we have seen, made his escape from the anticipated persecutions of Mary, taking with him the manuscripts and collectanea, which enabled him to publish his first edition of the History of the Church, at Strasburg \*. The Catalogus Testium of M. F. Illyricus *was printed in 1556, two years after the publication of the first edition of the work of Foxe. The Martyrologist, therefore, is not likely to have borrowed from Illyricus.*"

---

"\* See Watts's Bibliotheca, vol. i. p. 383. The book was published under this title :—'Rerum in Ecclesiâ gestarum, quæ postremis et periculosis his temporibus evenerunt, maximarumque per Europam Persecutionum, et Sanctorum Dei Martyrum cæterarumque rerum, si quæ insigniora exempla sint, digesti per Regna et Nationes.'—8vo. Strasburg, 1554."

Without knowing what I had just been writing about Fox's copying from Illyricus, he was induced to read this note to me, by his not being able to satisfy himself respecting the Latin; and

in particular, the *digesti* appeared to disagree with him, as, indeed, it seemed as if there was nothing with which it would or could agree. Perhaps, being a fellow of the noble College of which Mr. Townsend still writes himself a member, he was scandalized at what bore such marks of ignorance. Be this as it may, in my own mind, the effect was different. So many new ideas were raised, that I hardly know which I thought of first. It was very amazing to find the biographer and vindicator of Fox, after years of travail, going to such an authority as Watts's Bibliotheca Britannica for the title of the *editio princeps* of his great work, the only one by which he is known. Stranger still, that he should be so satisfied with such a barbarous and ungrammatical title as to print and publish it. Yet more wonderful, that he should allow himself to be put off with the title of the *second* edition, instead of the very different title of the *first*. Most marvellous of all, that he should, with innocent and ignorant simplicity, not only imagine, but ground an argument on the assumption, that what I quoted from the English edition, was, as a matter of course, in the Latin edition of 1554. His argument implies and absolutely requires this ignorance; for it is simply, that Fox, who published in 1554, could not borrow from a book published in 1556<sup>1</sup>.

I did not enter much into the subject with my friend; but as both the *first* and *second* editions were in the room, it was easy to show him that Mr. Townsend, while looking for the title of the *first* edition (Strasburg, 1554), had been put off with a faulty copy of the title of the *second* (Basil, 1559) which is as follows;—

“Rerum in Ecclesia gestarum, quæ postremis et periculosis his temporibus evenerunt, maximarumque per Europam Persecutionum, ac Sanctorum Dei Martyrum cæterarumque rerum, si quæ insignioris exempli sint,

---

<sup>1</sup> The absurdity of this assumption, and the ignorance which it displays of the small beginning and gradual increase of Fox's work may be made apparent to those who have never seen the books, by stating that my copy of Fox, from which, I presume, I copied the account of the Waldenses, weighs eighteen pounds; the little Strasburg book of 1554 (which was printed before the book of Illyricus, and which, it was taken for granted, contained all that the others did) does not weigh eleven ounces.



digesti per Regna et Nationes commentarii. Pars prima, in qua primum de rebus per Angliam et Scotiam gestis, atque in primis de horrenda sub Maria nuper regina, persecutione, narratio continetur. Autore Joanne Foxo Anglo. Basileæ, per Nicolaum Brylingerum et Joannem Oporinum."

The title of the Strasburg book, if Mr. Townsend had happened to know it, would, perhaps, have saved this exposure of his ignorance; for it clearly professes to begin its history from and after the time of Wicliffe; and, therefore, it might have been suspected that it did not contain the history of the Waldenses. It is as follows:—

"Chronicon Ecclesiæ, continens historiam rerum gestarum maximarumque per totam Europam Persecutionum a Vviclevi temporibus usque ad nostram ætatem. Authore Joanne Foxo. Hiis in calce accesserunt Aphorismi Joannis Vviclevi cum collectaneis quibusdam Reginaldi Pecoki Episcopi Cicestrensis. Item *Οπισογραφία* quædam ad Oxonienses. Argentorati. Excudebat Josias Richelius. Anno M.D.LXIIII." [erroneously for M.D.LIIII.]

These titles I showed to my friend; and, when he was gone, I thought it would be right to append to what I had written some sort of reply to this broad charge of ignorance, which Mr. Townsend had seen fit to make against me on the strength of what he is pleased to call "an examination of the facts of the case." It is obviously the plain sort of charge which is comprehended and remembered and repeated by every body. "Only think how stupid and ignorant in Mr. Maitland to charge Fox with copying from a book in 1554, that which was not published till 1556." Those who would not pretend to give an opinion on the general question, could see this plain enough. Such advantage bold ignorance always has in controversy; and it is only by patient exposure that it can be met. But my friend had shut the book, and I was too little acquainted with it to know where to find the note which he had been reading.

In turning over the leaves, however, I found another note on p. 288.

"Since I wrote my remarks on Mr. Dowling, who considers Illyricus and not Foxe to be the father of ecclesiastical history, I have procured the collation of the first edition of Foxe's work, published in 1556, with that of 1559, and with Illyricus, and find that I have been misled in the supposi-

tion, that the account of the Waldenses was in that edition. It first appeared in 1559, after the Catalogue of Illyricus had been published ; not before, as I had been informed."

When Mr. Townsend found out his mistake, did not common honesty require him to make some kind of reference to his contradiction of my suggestion, and his argument founded upon it ? Let it pass. How long after the other note this one was written, I cannot tell ; but I presume, that if it had not been after the former note was actually in print, that note would not have appeared. It seems, therefore, to show, that up to the time when the former note was in print, and probably up to the present moment, Mr. Townsend's acquaintance with the two first editions of the Martyrology is simply derived from what he calls "a collation," received after the first note was printed, and bearing very suspicious marks of having been furnished by his kinsman, or some of his unhappy "amanuenses," who are continually performing such works of art as turning 1554 into 1556, and other little things which cavillers lay hold of.

But really, in writing this note, I am very much in the condition in which Mr. Townsend has been while writing his contributions to Fox ; that is, in the predicament of a school-boy who is learning his lesson while he is saying it ; for almost every word of the preceding lines had been written when I most accidentally opened the book at p. 76, where Mr. Townsend says of Fox :—

"The first part of his great work was published at Strasburg, after he left Frankfort, and before he arrived at Basil. These circumstances enable us to ascertain that the materials must have been collected, and the MS. prepared, during his residence in Reigate. It exhibits no signs of having been hastily written, as it must have been if it had been prepared while he was travelling on the continent. It was written in Latin. Its title was 'Commentarii Rerum in Ecclesia gestarum, a Wiclefi temporibus usque ad annum M.D.' and was published at Strasburg, 1554, towards the end of which year the author probably left England. It contains the ecclesiastical history of two hundred years ; and it was as copious an account of that most interesting period as any which had then been published."

It will be observed, that in this *earlier* notice Mr. Townsend speaks critically, and gives us his opinion of the book as if he was acquainted with it. But if so, how could he give such an

erroneous account of its title? In the errata, however, referring to the first sentence of it, we find the following notice :—

“This is not quite correct. The *Commentarii* were published in 1554, and therefore before he had left Frankfort <sup>1</sup>, as is said in the previous sentence. See p. 80.”

And when we turn to p. 80, we find that “he proceeded by slow stages to Strasburg, where he committed to the press the first part of his labours,” and on it the following note :—

“The book was printed in Latin under the title, ‘*Rerum in Ecclesiâ gestarum, quæ postremis et periculosis his temporibus evenerunt, maximarumque per Europam Persecutionum, ac Sanctorum Dei, per Regna et Nationes.*’ Strasburg. 1554. 8vo.”

Here is another blundering, ungrammatical extract from the title of the *second* edition, given as the title of the first edition, and referred to with confidence and complacency in the table of “*Addenda et Corrigenda*,” which we may suppose to contain the most mature fruits of Mr. Townsend’s research.

<sup>1</sup> This is not the place for criticism on the biographical part of Mr. Townsend’s contributions ; but they partake of an infirmity which I have had occasion to remark upon in the work to which they are prefixed ; namely, that in quoting a passage to set right one mistake, one is too often obliged either to notice, or to seem to acquiesce in, one or two others of a different kind. Mr. Townsend’s attempt to correct a very gross and ignorant misstatement, is itself an error quite as gross, if not more so. He says, that Fox “probably” left England at “the *end*” of the year 1554 ; when, if he had known this first edition, the style of which he criticises, he would have seen that the prefatory epistle was dated from Strasburg, 31st August, 1554 ; and Fox’s complaint, that the bookseller’s anxiety to be in time for the fair had allowed him only two months to prepare the volume, seems to intimate that he had been there during at least that period : “*Rursus nec amplius bimestri spatio ante nundinas Franckfordianas mihi concedebatur ad hæc ex rudi ac infirmi sylvula recolligenda*,” p. 206. *b*. But the important point to be observed is, that the Strasburg book was *not* printed “after he left Frankfort,” nor “before he had left Frankfort,” except inasmuch as it was printed before he went to Frankfort at all. Whether he accompanied his booksellers to the fair, I know not, but I believe the first proof of his being there is his signature to a letter written at Frankfort, dated the 3rd December, (Troub. of Fr. p. xxv.) and he seems to have remained at Frankfort until Aug. 31, 1555, when adhering to the more violent party in the schism which took place, he seceded with them ; or, to use the language of the ‘*Troubles of Frankfort*,’ “The oppressed church departed from Frankfort to Basil and Geneva, some staying at Basil, as Maister Fox with other,” p. LIX.

This is a strange way of writing biography, especially the life of a man whose life would probably never have been written at all, but for the work of which his biographer so blunders the title and confounds the editions.

Perhaps some where or other in Mr. Townsend's contributions there is (I believe there ought to be) another note telling his readers that his correction in the note on p. 288 is a blunder, and that the account of the Waldenses is no more in the edition of 1559 than in that of 1554.

#### NOTE B, on Page 11.

I was unwilling to encumber the text with a note not exactly relating to the matter in hand ; but yet I think it right to notice the disingenuous manner in which Mr. Cattley represents this little affair. He says, "excepting the parenthesis, 'for he took away the marriage of priests.'" Mr. Cattley knows that this was not *all* the parenthesis. He knows that he has here suppressed the particular words which made his blunder so gross and obvious. My remark upon it was : "The words 'for he took away the marriage of priests, as Henry Mutius witnesseth,' are, in the Edition of 1583, inclosed in a parenthesis, which the Editor of the new edition has removed. That he observed the name is plain, for with that petty tampering which seems to have been his principal employment as editor, he has turned Henricus into Henry, without attempting to translate the other half of the man's name, or testifying the least surprise at finding him in a decree of a Council held in 1080."—*Review*, p. 51.

THE END.













U. C. BERKELEY LIBRARIES



C065174165

